

A4046

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 1, 1966

northcoast waters as an interim solution to the Colorado River problem.

In closing, as some of you know, I just returned from the World Forestry Congress in Spain. While our principle mission was to observe the progress of improved forestry in other sections of the world, I also asked our friends in Spain about their progress in water resource development. Immediately, they proudly responded by advising that they have already developed 80% of their hydrological potential. Gentlemen, this is a country that is supposed to be substantially behind us in technology and engineering. I only wish we had 80% of the North Coast's hydrological potential already developed.

In attending this world conference, one could not help but feel that the eyes of the world are upon us—constantly seeking ideas and information from a diversified, viable and wealthy country, recognized as a world leader. The world is craving for our leadership. The image we create and the example we set is now in the making. In the eyes of the world, our international purpose will be judged by our domestic performance. Somehow, I get the feeling we can and must do more in accelerating water resource development—can any red-blooded American refuse to accept this challenge?

I stand ready to cooperate with you in every way possible. Thank you for the privilege of speaking to this very distinguished group of water experts.

### Vietnam's Crucial Election

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD two columns that appeared recently in the Washington, D.C., Post. Together they give the American people some heartening news about U.S. efforts in developing peace throughout the world:

#### Vietnam's Crucial Election

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

No matter how much the critics may ridicule it, the September 11 election in South Vietnam may well give President Johnson his first important break in the agonizing war in Southeast Asia.

One major reason for this bright assessment is the murderous sabotage and terror campaign that the Vietcong has now begun in an effort to undermine the entire electoral process. This means the Vietcong regards the election as potentially disastrous.

Consider, for example, well-authenticated reports to Washington of a Vietcong attack on the party headquarters of the Vietnamese QDD Party, a strongly nationalistic, anti-Communist political party in Quang Tin province in the northern part of the country.

On July 14 or 15—the date is uncertain—a number of officials of this party, which is running several candidates as delegates to the constitutional convention, were murdered in a Vietcong attack which could have had only one purpose: to terrorize the party and frighten it into boycotting the election. One of the prospective candidates lost both his legs in the attack. He still intends, nonetheless, to be a candidate in the election.

This incident is not isolated. The South Vietnamese government is now studying intelligence reports from at least five other provinces that the Communist Vietcong are planning campaigns of sabotage.

The Vietcong, of course, is barred from

running candidates of its own. But because it is working so hard to hold down the vote in the election, a big turnout will constitute a major defeat for the Vietcong.

Thus the conclusion is inescapable that for the Vietcong and its political arm, the National Liberation Front, the election is a Trojan horse. It will reveal for the first time the weakness of the Vietcong.

And this revelation will dramatize the essential correctness of President Johnson's conviction that the overwhelming majority of South Vietnam's population of 16 million has no tie of sympathy, ideology or loyalty to the Vietcong.

The unofficial U.S. estimate of the number of South Vietnamese citizens who would willingly support the Vietcong runs to around 5 or 6 per cent. Well-informed estimates from eastern European Communist sources are not much higher—around 8 per cent.

Up to now it has been difficult for the President to illustrate this basic fact. But if the election goes as expected, that in itself will dramatize what Mr. Johnson has been saying for so long: That the United States is in South Vietnam to stop aggression from the north and that left to its own devices, South Vietnam would overwhelmingly reject the Communists.

An outpouring of between 4 and 5 million voters should be a powerful demonstration to the rest of the world that the development of free political institutions in South Vietnam is a real possibility.

There are also, of course, hazards in this first election (to be followed by election of an assembly after agreement has been reached on a constitution). The 108 winners among more than 700 candidates have only one job: To draft a constitution for a country that has never had one. It is impossible to predict how this first elected convention will act.

For example, it is not ruled out that the constitutional convention, as the first national body in South Vietnam's history to be chosen in a relatively free election might try to reconstitute itself as a parliamentary body and claim for itself the powers of government. No one expects this to happen, but no one can know for sure what will happen when it convenes in late September.

That is no more a hazard than the catalogue of hazards President Johnson lives with every day in pursuing his goal in Vietnam. The important thing about the election is that it has stirred up intense and healthy interest among the political parties and that it is certain to expose the fraudulence of the claim of the Vietcong to be the true representative of the people.

#### SIGNS THAT WE'RE WINNING COLD WAR

(By Drew Pearson)

Some of the professional scaremongers who see the world going hell-bent toward communism have been trying to persuade the American public that we are losing the Cold War. This has long been the theme of Sen. Tom Dodd's Internal Security Committee and anyone who disagrees with either the Committee or Dodd's conduct is called a "leftist" by his pal, Gen. Julius Klein.

However, I have visited much of the world in the past 18 months and in my opinion we are winning, not losing, the Cold War.

In Africa, the pro-Communist Ben Bella has been kicked out of Algeria; while President Kwame Nkrumah, the Chinese puppet of Ghana, has been given the gate by his own people. In East Africa, when U.S. Ambassador Bill Atwood retired, the people of Kenya came out with placards reading: "Yankee don't go home."

When Chinese Foreign Minister Ch'en Yi traveled through Africa some months ago advocating wars of liberation, he turned practically every leader against him. Africa is now almost totally pro-West and anti-Com-

munist, with even President Nasser of Egypt on shaky political legs—despite the Aswan Dam.

#### VICTORIES IN ASIA

In Pakistan, President Ayub Khan, who has been flirting with the Chinese, has now thrown out his pro-Communist Foreign Minister, Zulf Kar Bhutto, and is sliding back into the pro-West camp.

India, once the champion of the Red Chinese, has learned the hard way. During the recent worry over the execution of American prisoners in Hanoi, the Indian Embassy here and Premier Indira Gandhi in Moscow pressured the Russians to use their influence with Hanoi to block any war crimes trial.

In Southeast Asia, Indonesia has put Sukarno on the sidelines and cleaned out every single Chinese Communist. Simultaneously, Indonesia has dropped its war against Malaysia, and that country is now even more pro-West.

In Japan, where we lost friends as a result of the Vietnam war, the socialists are still fuming, but the middle class has a better understanding of the American position and the situation has improved.

In Cyprus, where Greece and Turkey, two good U.S. allies, were almost on the verge of war last year, both sides have come to their senses. Communist agitators who once had a field day in Greece and Turkey have piped down.

#### RED INDEPENDENCE

Perhaps the most important change in any part of the world is taking place among the European Communist-bloc nations.

When I visited Yugoslavia in 1950 I reported that nation would drift into a moderate type of socialism similar to that of the British Labor government. The Truman Administration, which simultaneously continuing this policy, sold had come to the same conclusion, launched a policy of aiding Yugoslavia—also Poland—with surplus grain. The Eisenhower Administration, President Tito even jet fighters and trained Yugoslav pilots in Texas, despite the criticism of the right wing.

The policy has paid off. Today Yugoslavia enjoys freedom of religion, freedom of farming, freedom of small business. Only the public utilities and major industries, as in England which is nationalizing steel, are government owned.

Recently Tito uncovered the same kind of wire-tapping which our Justice Department has revealed to the Supreme Court. Tito kicked out, however, Aleksandar Randovic, the man responsible for it.

Other European Communist countries, while not as independent as Yugoslavia, are drifting in that direction.

#### SEEKS MORE U.S. TRADE

All the European Communists are eager for more trade with the United States, and if Representative WILBUR MILLS (Democrat of Arkansas), Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, hadn't thumbed his nose at the White House when the President wanted to loosen trade barriers, we would now be doing an expanding business with this part of the world. Instead the Germans, French and British are making money in these markets.

In Latin America, the resentment against the United States over our landing of Marines in the Dominican Republic has cooled off. Most Latins are convinced by the steady withdrawal of U.S. troops that we have no ulterior motives on that island, and the welcome given to President Johnson by Mexico, the chief critic of our Dominican policy, demonstrated that the Dominican incident is now water over the dam.

At one time the Chinese Communists considered Latin America one of their chief targets, second only to Africa. They were more active in Cuba than the Russians, and were definitely behind Castro's terrorist drive on nearby Venezuela. That drive has now fizzled. So have the drives in Panama and other Latin countries.

August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4045

to determine whether or not we have an adequate plan of action, and the most advanced equipment ready, on a stand-by basis, to be "cranked into action" should fires break out during this coming season. Believe me, I've had the willing cooperation of everyone, particularly the people directly involved in "carrying-out" the program. They've welcomed our intervention because with their personal knowledge of the inadequacies, they welcomed our "carrying the torch" for improving their cause.

While fire disasters may appear irrelevant to flood control and water conservation, I can assure you that forest fire are equally categorized as disasters and demand the attention of all of us. Further, as constituents you are entitled to this "progress report" as well.

Returning now to Water Resource Development, there are a few cogent points I would like to make.

First of all, as many people have told you, things are happening all around us, that have heretofore been non-existent. As your very able water consultant, Harvey Banks, has told you, he is withholding presentation of the final draft of his report because of what has happened recently on the Colorado River, Metropolitan Water District and Columbia River Developments.

The fact that Glen Smith of the Metropolitan Water District made the statement "that MWD may propose to increase the size of the Tehachapi Pumping Plant and the East Branch, to be capable of serving until 2020, is of great significance and bears watching and intense review. I have every confidence that Mr. Banks and your organization will maintain ready vigilance and increase your communications with MWD.

Because of the increasing demands for water everywhere, the study for a regional plan to transport waters into the Colorado River, a supplemental water supply for Southern California, the expanding regional developments of the Southwestern States, with Texas and Kansas being recently added to the picture, the widening controversy over the Columbia River water export plans, and its 25-year construction timetable, the population expansion projections for the San Joaquin and Sacramento valleys, the readily recognized need to supplement the Delta Pool water requirements and the many increasing demands of our State Water Plan, one can only conclude what we've known and predicted for some time, the attention given our north coast water resources will be substantially greater.

There are many reasons for this, but the principle fact that stands out is the consideration of our North Coast water resources as an interim supply. A water supply that will be needed in other areas of California until such time as the Columbia River water agreements are worked out, the 25 year construction schedule completed or an efficient and effective system of desalinization become technologically and economically feasible. Again, I want to remind you of my previous reference to the MWD statement to further stress this point.

Quite naturally, with our common desire to accelerate the project developments, this could be very timely in providing us with the potential economic justification of our projects. To say the least, it is very tempting to see this possibility evolve. But, it also prompts me to suggest that we must all accelerate our efforts in determining the water policy objectives of our region and our respective communities and counties, making certain that our own water needs are adequately protected and provided for. Again, your actions in developing the joint exercise of powers agreement and the report of Harvey Banks here today indicate you're moving in the right direction.

With the Inter-Agency group having divided up the projects on the Eel, Van Duzen

and Mad Rivers, and delineated the function that each agency should pursue, it becomes our joint responsibility to set a series of deadlines and/or target dates when all projects in our package or master plan can be completed. Certainly, a projected timetable by each agency, available to all, would be very helpful to people interested in our progress.

With the very obvious competition for appropriations, I again would like to stress the importance of each agency concentrating on its own area of responsibility, thereby minimizing duplication of effort and maximizing the opportunity for simultaneous action and progress. This will be an accelerated Public Works program at its best. We on our committee are pushing this concept.

I believe your Association should support Bureau projects where there is clear evidence that cheap agricultural water is needed; Corps of Engineers projects when the principle purpose is flood control and water supply; projects of the State of California, perhaps in cooperation with the Corps or the Bureau of Reclamation, providing those projects give suitable local benefits to the project area and make local water supply available.

It becomes increasingly obvious, we must take further steps to become a part of the overall planning process. The time for thinking in terms of Regional Planning is now. The overall impact on lands located in some of the project areas will require our attention. Land Use Planning must be brought up to date to coincide with the Regional water plans.

The people and the communities of our area will be looking for more specific answers to their questions—when, where and how? When will the project get started, where will it be located and how much will it cost or how much can I expect to benefit from this start. The Bureau of Reclamation has advised me of their progress in developing concepts of future agricultural crop patterns as influenced by ample irrigation water on a regionwide basis.

As I've stated before, we will become increasingly dependent upon you for guidance and direction, so that we are advancing the projects in keeping with the water policy objectives of you and the people you represent.

We must, at the earliest possible date start translating some of these studies and plans with a positive program of action. We can and must see concrete results. Part of this is happening. Needless to say, it is thrilling to see the "dirt fly" on the Redwood Creek project, we have provided the funds for the start on Corte Madera Creek and we are asking for a construction start on Dry Creek. As I told the appropriations committee members, it is vital to keep these projects moving on schedule so as to prevent a future "logjam" in funding the construction starts.

As we seek all possible means of accelerating our projects, we might look back on the years prior to construction of the Oroville Dam. Every consultant proclaimed the Oroville project could not be justified until 1980. The Director of Water Resources, administratively, apparently with the backing of the Governor, went ahead with the project. The decision to proceed was made in September of 1960. This has been later referred to as the decision with "the proper mixture of engineering and guts".

A most significant fact occurred in later years—the project was completed to a point where it performed the flood control purpose—just one week before the 1964 flood hit.

The Director of Water Resources who made that decision was Harvey Banks.

As we discuss methods of accelerating these projects, I would like to touch briefly on a matter that has "bugged" me for a long time. Having traveled throughout the United States visiting areas hard hit by similar natural disasters, I concluded that one of the major problems facing the Congress was the "horse and buggy" criteria being used for benefit to

cost ratio justification. I am thoroughly convinced that it does not recognize the total picture when considering the economic factors associated with disasters and flood protective works.

It has become increasingly clear that the State and the Bureau will not build the Middle Fork and English Ridge projects respectively unless they actually need the water in the Sacramento Valley and Southern California. On the other hand, the North Coast needs flood control at an early time. We are looking at two or three possible criteria changes that might embody the following principles to allow early project construction:

1. Payment, in addition to flood control allocation, for interest and principal on the allocation to water conservation, during the period of years before water is used, perhaps, with a maximum number of years specified. This payment could be non-reimbursable to the Federal Government in that when water is used, the using agency would only pick up payments to the end of the original period.

2. Payment by the Federal Government for principal and interest on conservation storage until water is used, with the payout period to begin at the time water is used and extend for the full period prescribed in present law.

3. Payment by the Federal Government for interest and principal on conservation allocation until water is used, with these payments by the Federal Government to be repaid by water users as a surcharge on future water rates.

In discussing criteria, there is another matter that is deserving of more attention—the consideration for aesthetics. The retention and enhancement of as much natural beauty as possible, during the construction stages of our various projects, would be serving the public interest and must be given a higher priority in the future. This is particularly true when flood control projects are built through the center of communities such as Napa and those along the Corte Madera Creek in Marin. Again, our committee will be looking for possible incremental additions in future criteria changes.

Some of these questions might be asked. How do you value flood control? Where two major catastrophes have occurred in the past ten years, what criteria should apply toward timing of the projects? It is very difficult to establish quantitative criteria without providing proper value judgment on the magnitude of the risk. Who knows when the 100 year or 1,000 year storm is going to come? We do know, from the experiences of the last three years alone, that the frequency of the storms and floods are on the increase, nationwide. I can speak with authority because I've been to these areas.

In addition to the flood recovery and rehabilitation costs, the one question that keeps coming to my mind is the lack of adequate consideration for increased values in land and improvements, that can be anticipated, immediately following the completion of a flood control or reclamation facility. This has occurred in every part of the country where similar projects are now in place. I am convinced we can safely expect this trend to continue.

With this in mind I have asked for answers to these questions from our committee and staff, obviously seeking improvements to our established criteria, techniques and methodology for economic evaluation. We are asking for a similar review by the Bureau of the Budget. In the coming months, I will be pursuing this objective to the maximum—if you agree with me, I hope you join in presenting the point of view and suggestions of your organization.

Again, the results of these evaluations should prove helpful as we emphasize the concept of accelerated development of the



August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4047

## Milwaukee and Organized Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, much has appeared in the Nation's press in the past few days concerning the Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in the Braves baseball case.

The decision has been interpreted in some circles as vindicating the stand of organized professional baseball. This is far from true, as is explained in the Milwaukee Journal editorial of July 28, 1966.

In fact, the decision clears up one ambiguity in the Milwaukee position. Milwaukee contended that baseball was a monopoly and thereby evil, on the one hand, and asked for another franchise or a return of the Braves on the other. In other words, there was a seeming willingness to employ the monopoly argument to the extent that it would bring the community what it wanted.

This apparent contradiction in goals had always been of concern to me because if Milwaukee had been given a team, it might be interpreted that baseball once again had been able to "buy" its way out of a tight spot.

As I have said over and over, the problem of organized baseball's monopolistic practices go far beyond the boundaries of Milwaukee or Wisconsin. These practices affect every major city in the Nation which has a major league club.

Today Milwaukee and Wisconsin stand purged of any taint of self-interest. They can take the case to the U.S. Supreme Court on the basic principle that the present conduct of the big business of baseball has placed it firmly within the sphere of those activities which Congress meant to affect with antitrust laws.

It is my firm belief that the circumstances warrant the Supreme Court taking another, hard look at the baseball monopoly. Since 1953 when the Court last ruled, there have been these developments:

First, baseball's owners and operators have demonstrated an increasing inability to discipline themselves against flaunting the public interest in the search for the fast buck.

Second, the increasing dependence of baseball on lucrative television contracts has placed baseball ever more firmly than before in the mainstream of interstate commerce.

Third, the failure of Congress to bring baseball within the scope of existing antitrust regulations clearly does not indicate satisfaction with the status quo. Rather (most all Members of Congress who have spoken on the subject favor the inclusion of baseball under antitrust.

The differences of opinion have come over issues of what exceptions are to be granted baseball once it is made subject to antitrust legislation. Some want to give baseball broad privileges. Others,

like myself, want it restricted in the public interest.

On those issues, basically, legislation changing the status of baseball has been stalled.

The U.S. Supreme Court could play an important role in ending this impasse by taking judicial note of the general approval within Congress for "normalizing" the position of organized baseball.

If the High Court should strip baseball of its exemption from antitrust regulation, new legislation would quite clearly be needed to prevent a situation of chaos from resulting in organized baseball. This legislation would be given priority consideration and differences on the extent of privileges could be determined in open debate.

This, it seems to me, is the very least we can expect if the national pastime is to be taken out of the hands of the carpetbaggers and returned to the fans.

The editorial follows:

BRAVES WIN, ON TECHNICALITY; AND THERE'LL BE A REPLAY

The Braves drew four bases on balls for the winning run in the Wisconsin supreme court Wednesday. It is not a proud way to win a ball game. And it doesn't wrap up any pennant.

Giddy claims by the baseball commissioner, National league president and Atlanta mayor—that the court "vindicated" the baseball monopoly, found no violation of state law, saw baseball's desertion of Milwaukee to be "just and fair"—were total nonsense.

The court did exactly the opposite. It denounced everything about the Braves' move, both legally and morally. And that judgment was a unanimous one. The bare majority merely decided that the state law's enforcement arm couldn't reach the Braves, through no virtue of theirs.

The baseball industry is indeed a monopoly, Justice Fairchild wrote; it is indeed in restraint of trade, and its operations would be "rife with violations" of both state and federal laws—if the former could be applied and the latter were to be. Justice Heffernan repeated the guilty verdict on behalf of the dissenters.

The state's case against the Braves has foundered, as of today, on the rock of jurisdiction only. The majority found that "national policy" has thus far exempted baseball from antitrust enforcement, even if all by inference—by mere inaction of congress to include it by name, and by the United States supreme court's whimsical view in 1953 that the inaction expresses intent to allow the exemption. A state's attempt to fill the enforcement gap, being "in conflict with national policy," as the majority found, must yield. This, by the way, does not at all void the state antitrust law for other uses.

The dissent appears to have been written more in frustration over the result than in real opposition to it. The minority felt that, "where congress has failed to act to protect the states from monopolistic predators," a state ought to be able to act for itself. Some of the majority couldn't quite go this far because of a belief that a nationwide monopoly has to be disciplined uniformly if at all—that is, federally.

A 4 to 3 court vote is just as conclusive legally as 7 to 0 would be. Especially in a case like this, however, the split emphasizes how conscientious and learned judges may differ over a difficult question, and that invites further appeal.

Atty. Gen. La Follette is therefore correct to seek review by the United States supreme court. In case that court should wish to

rescue itself from its 1953 ruling, this might be the opportunity. But it may prefer to let the issue come up through the federal courts under federal law.

It probably must be accepted now that baseball is not about to be forced legally to return the Braves to Milwaukee or assign another franchise right away. Justice Fairchild pointed out the irony that such a result, if possible, would still be making use of a monopoly power, and condoning it for that one purpose.

This leaves Wisconsin chosen by circumstances as the protagonist for the principle that the monopolistic conduct of baseball is morally wrong, economically harmful, and either is or ought to be illegal, by decree of the supreme court or congress or both. It would be hard to let the matter drop at this point with that principle at stake.

Hanoi Warned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 12, 1966

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, Hanoi's threat to try our captured airmen as war criminals has aroused a storm of fury to which Ho Chi Minh had better pay heed.

The press continues to point out that the consequences of such an outrage could be disastrous. Two editorials which I offer here for the RECORD state this possibility in vigorous terms.

In short, the Los Angeles Times and Philadelphia Inquirer declare that Hanoi is playing with fire.

Its propaganda objectives would backfire.

Its hope of intimidating us would, of course, fall flat.

North Vietnam has been warned from many quarters against carrying out its threat.

These newspapers wisely advise the aggressor in Vietnam not to make any dangerous miscalculations.

Their editorials follow in full:

[From the Los Angeles Times, July 15, 1966]

## WAR CRIMES TRIALS IN HANOI

North Vietnam has given indications that it is preparing to put captured American fliers on trial as "war criminals," with some East European sources reporting that the legal farces may begin as early as next week. If such outrages do in fact take place, the consequences for the Hanoi regime could prove disastrous.

In violation of the 1949 Geneva Convention on the rules of war, signed by North Vietnam in 1957, U.S. pilots have already been paraded in handcuffs through the streets of Hanoi, and subjected to public abuse. One of the specific obligations of the Geneva Convention is the protection of war prisoners against intimidation, insults, public curiosity—and reprisals.

Hanoi plainly has some definite political-propaganda purposes in mind with its threatened show trials. One of them is bolstering the morale of the North Vietnamese people by openly humiliating and punishing U.S. fliers who have helped bring destruction to the military and economic sinews of the country.

Undoubtedly, too, Hanoi must feel that reprisals would have an effect on the morale of

A4048

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 1, 1966

other U.S. fliers who daily take part in attacks on North Vietnam.

But perhaps the most important aim seen by Hanoi is an attempt to influence U.S. public opinion. North Vietnam puts great stock in the anti-war demonstrations in this country, remembering that deep political and popular divisions in France in the early 1950's played a major role in sapping French strength in the Indochina war. Reprisals against U.S. prisoners, in Hanoi's view, could exacerbate divisions in the United States and result in new pressures on the President to end the war quickly, on Hanoi's terms.

Is it really possible that North Vietnam's leaders are so grossly misinformed, or so self-deluded, that they think the United States can be intimidated by these acts of barbarism? As Winston Churchill once asked about another enemy, "What kind of a people do they think we are!"

The American reaction to any North Vietnamese show trials would not be one of despair or fear, nor would it turn more people against the U.S. government's policies. On the contrary; the predictable reaction would be one of the most severe condemnation, and of greater unity behind the President than has been seen for some time. The demands for stern reprisals would be overwhelming.

Hanoi, which has often enough miscalculated the mood and determination of the U.S. government and the American people, may now be on the verge of its most dangerous miscalculation of all. It still has time to back away, but does it have enough sense to do so?

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 19, 1966]

#### HANOI HAS HAD ITS WARNING

The North Vietnamese can't say that they have not been fully warned of the consequences, should they carry out their threats to try, and to execute, captured American fliers as war criminals.

Since Hanoi first voiced the threat, there has been a flood of protest in this and other countries, plus a demand that the fliers be treated humanely, according to civilized standards, as prisoners of war.

The protests have been accompanied by warnings that mistreatment of the captives would most certainly arouse American indignation to a fever pitch and unite the Nation in a call for stepped-up military action in Vietnam.

President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk and members of Congress including Senators who have consistently opposed Administration policy in Vietnam, have joined in asking humane treatment of the pilot prisoners.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant has warned North Vietnam that war crime trials of the airmen would generate intense escalation of the war. Formal U.S. diplomatic warning against the trial or execution of the prisoners has been given North Vietnam through the medium of the Egyptian Foreign Ministry in Cairo and Arthur J. Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, has informed officials of the International Red Cross in Geneva of the disastrous consequences that would follow the mistreatment of the American prisoners.

The history books are filled with the products of miscalculation, when national leaders failed to read correctly the probable reaction to a certain line of policy. There is no excuse for similar folly in Hanoi today.

Ho Chi-Minh has chosen to play with fire in his abusive treatment of prisoners of war, by inciting street mobs to demands for the captives' blood in reprisal against American bombing. He must not play this dangerous game too far. He has been told what the consequences will be. Unless he is inviting destruction, he had better back away.

### New Jersey Bell: A Company Dedicated to Service

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the telephone is an essential utility which most Americans take for granted. We assume that telephone service is always available, ready to fulfill our needs and bring help in times of emergency. We usually do not stop to consider that our telephone system is also an important economic asset to our economy, or to realize that the excellent service we receive is due to the teamwork and coordination of all the people who make the system work—in research, in manufacturing, and in operations. In the Newark Star-Ledger of July 26, 1966, Mr. Robert D. Lilley, president of New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., has contributed a most informative guest column describing the role of his company in New Jersey's flourishing economy and the dedication of the people who work for this outstanding organization.

I include it in the RECORD following my remarks:

UTILITY: COMMUNICATIONS PROGRESS HINGES ON TEAMWORK

(By Robert D. Lilley)

One significant measure of the economic health and progress of our state is communications growth—the growth of facilities and the growth of telephone calling volumes.

And by this yardstick, New Jersey has really grown and is continuing to surge forward. Local and long distance calling volumes have risen 73 per cent in 10 years and the number of New Jersey Bell telephones in service has increased more than 60 per cent.

By the end of 1965, New Jersey Bell's 2,100,000 business and residence customers were using more than 3,600,000 telephones and making 15,307,000 calls on an average business day, a sharp climb of 580,000 calls a day over the 1964 average.

To keep pace with this communications explosion, New Jersey Bell has invested more than \$1.2 billion in new buildings and equipment over the last 10 years, ample evidence that our business shares in the general economic improvement of the state and contributes to it.

Last year alone, our construction program totaled \$154.8 million. And we paid \$113 million in taxes to the federal government and \$39 million to state and local governments. This is neither a boast nor a complaint—taxes are the price we pay for the privilege—and I use that word in its literal sense—of being corporate citizens of New Jersey.

If all expenditures of Bell System companies in New Jersey during 1965 are combined—including those of New Jersey Bell, the Western Electric Company and Bell Telephone Laboratories—the total figure comes to more than \$850 million. All of the money was invested to maintain, expand and improve communications services.

On an annual basis, the Bell System pours \$300 million more into New Jersey than it takes out, establishing a very favorable

"balance of payments" that certainly bolsters the state's economy.

Today's telephone network performs well because the people who design it, the people who make it work, and the people who run it, work for a common goal—excellent service for the people who use it. The close integration of research at Bell Telephone Laboratories; manufacture at Western Electric, and operations, at New Jersey Bell, guarantee the efficient functioning of the highly complex network that links our customers to 183,000,000 telephones throughout the world.

It also guarantees communications progress and growth: basic and applied research translated into designs, designs into products and products into customers' services, with the interval between each state compressed to the extent that the entire process is continuous and overlapping, rather than sequential and broken.

Teamwork and the sharing of goals, in an organization as closely knit as the telephone network itself, are two of the most important contributors to the quality and economy of Bell System service.

Another important contributing factor is the regulatory climate in which our company operates. For more than 50 years on the State level, and 30 on the National, our business—the adequacy of its services, the prices we charge and the profits we earn—has been under close and continuing regulatory scrutiny by New Jersey's Public Utilities Commission and the Federal Communications Commission.

The general excellence of communications service and development here in New Jersey and throughout the United States is indicative of the health of this climate and the interest of regulatory agencies in providing scope and incentive for communications progress.

Over the long run, I feel that the most important contributor to service quality and economy is integrity. I realize that the word "integrity" implies moral and ethical imperatives that, in some peoples' minds, are not usually associated with business objectives and operations.

But in a democratic country, the whole structure of society rests on the assumption that people are doing their jobs honestly, responsibly and intelligently, whether they work in the public or in the private sector.

The progress of the Bell System—the progress of our economy in general—depends on such integrity; integrity of purpose, integrity of intelligence and the integrity bred by regulation, self-criticism and a stubborn refusal to "leave well enough alone."

### New York Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary Joins Fight Against Noise Pollution

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the fight against noise pollution is a continuing one. My bill, H.R. 14602, discussed in my floor statement on April 21, at page 8339 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with additional detail on May 2 at page 9024, May 3 at page 9223, May 16 at page A2629, and June 2 at page



August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4035

ists since he was "dedicated" at the annual Audubon "T-Bone Days" program in the fall of 1964.

In east-central Iowa, along Highway 6, the residents of Marengo are in the process of building a giant pig—also of Paul Bunyan-like stature. The pig's purpose is the same as the Hereford Bull built near Audubon: to salute a proud, local industry and, at the same time, to be a tourist attraction.

Iowa is one of the last states, according to Director Caudle, to prepare to take advantage of tourism as an industry. The problem now is to make known the things the state has to offer—like the "Little Switzerland" area of northeast Iowa, the Grotto of the Redemption at West Bend, the Little Brown Church in the Vale near Nashua, the Maquoketa Caves, the Spook Cave near McGregor, and the like.

Investment needed: He feels, too, that such attractions will require additional investment by local, private concerns. For example, in the Elkader area in northeast Iowa, the traveler can find only one or two motels around. The tourist of today generally is a family man who wants a family type of place to stay. And the age of the Holiday Inn—Howard Johnson type of motel, with free ice, dispensing machines, air-conditioning, swimming pools and family rates has made existing, 1930-type motels and old hotels more obsolete than ever.

Some tourism officials look for cooperative efforts between various states, such as the Hiawatha Trail project that was set up jointly by Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin and Minnesota. The tourist today can pick up maps, a brochure and other information about the Hiawatha Trail that zig-zags across the states, linking together many tourist sites and points of interest.

In the future for Iowa, Mr. Caudle envisions genuine efforts by the local Chambers of Commerce to set up tourist centers, and to do more than merely keep the peace along Main Street.

### Right Tack on Prisoners

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post restates public revulsion at Hanoi's threat to try U.S. pilots but also declares President Johnson took the right tack in inviting North Vietnam to discuss the treatment of prisoners under the auspices of the International Red Cross.

By so doing, the newspaper says editorially, the President accomplished several things.

He opened the way for withdrawal of the North Vietnamese threat—which may or may not already be reflected in Hanoi's reply to the Columbia Broadcasting System's query on the prisoners.

He laid the base for broader international support of our view on the issue.

And he gave Hanoi an incentive for attending a conference to obtain guarantees regarding the treatment of its men who are captured in the south.

In any event, the Post asserts that by carrying out its threat Hanoi would certainly close ranks in this country behind our policy in Vietnam.

The wisdom of this policy has been proved by the subsequent North Vietnamese backdown on this issue.

I offer this editorial to be printed in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1966]

#### THE PRISONERS

The President took the right tack in inviting Hanoi to discuss under Red Cross aegis the treatment of prisoners in Vietnam. By avoiding specific threats and ultimatums, he left open the way for North Vietnam to care properly for the American pilots in its hands without seeming to capitulate. But he left no doubt as to the profound concern which he and the American people share for the fliers now in Hanoi.

Mr. Johnson was wise to give the assignment he did to the proposed Red Cross conference: not just to protect the American prisoners but "to discuss ways in which the Geneva conventions of 1949 can be given fuller and more complete application in Vietnam." By putting the emphasis on the Geneva conventions, rather than on any specific beneficiaries, Mr. Johnson served two goals. He enabled quarters not necessarily sympathetic to American policy in Vietnam to lend their support on the prisoner issue. And, perhaps more important, he gave Hanoi the incentive of attending the conference in order to win better treatment for its own forces or sympathizers captured in the South. Their fate, as Senator STEPHEN YOUNG pointed out, has often been cruel.

A hint has come from Moscow that the prisoner issue was responsible for the partial mobilization just ordered by President Ho Chi Minh. North Vietnam may be preparing, according to these reports, to cope with a potential American-sponsored punitive invasion of the North. No one can know, of course, how the United States would react to the punishment or even the trial of the pilots. But that dissent would be stilled and that the country would close ranks behind the President cannot be doubted at all.

What an incalculable blunder it would be for North Vietnam, in an act intended to knit the morale of its own people, to try and punish the pilots and thereby heal the division of the American people—the very division which is the central basis of Hanoi's hope to win the war.

### A Department of Transportation

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an address made on the subject of "A Department of Transportation" on June 22, 1966, at a congressional luncheon held in Washington, D.C., by Morris Forghash, president of the United States Freight Co. Mr. Forghash is one of the outstanding authorities in the field of transportation, not only in the United States, but throughout the world. His views in enthusiastic support of the establishment of a Department of Transportation are worthy of profound consideration:

#### A DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (Comments by Morris Forghash)

It is a distinct honor and privilege to be able to discuss with this distinguished group

a subject which has had top priority on my personal agenda for quite a long time.

I am sure that most of you know I enthusiastically support the establishment of a Department of Transportation. My position was not arrived at recently and it is not surrounded by caveats and reservations. The question of establishing a Transportation Department has been the subject of many studies. I directed one of them in the 1950's as Chairman of a Panel of the Transportation Council, U.S. Department of Commerce. We have made the results of that study, which culminated in an almost unanimous recommendation for a Department of Transportation, available to your Committees.

You gentlemen of the Congress have heard a great deal of testimony on this subject in recent weeks. I am sure there was a large amount of repetition, and I imagine some of you are wondering whether there is anything new that can be said on the subject. Perhaps there is nothing I can add to what has been said on the merits or demerits of various specific provisions of the pending bills, but I would like to give you some of my views with respect to the perspective in which I think this subject should be evaluated.

It is my sincere belief that the only wise and responsible approach to the question confronting your Committees and the Congress is first to determine whether the establishment of a Department of Transportation is sound, in principle, and wise as a matter of public policy and, if it is so determined, then to establish a Department even if it does not include all of the activities which it may or should ultimately embrace. You may call this a "half a loaf is better than none" attitude, and perhaps it is, but in view of the desperate need for getting organized and getting some action in the field of transportation, I would say we had better at least get started before it is too late.

I think there is significance in the fact that of all the numerous witnesses who have testified on the subject they supported the principle—the idea—of a Department of Transportation almost to a man. Indeed, if we reflect for a moment I think we must all conclude that we will have a Department to bring together the widely dispersed but increasingly important functions of the Federal Government in transportation sooner or later. As I said shortly after the President submitted the current proposal, it is my firm conviction that the tide of history has already swept us past the point of decision whether there should be a Department of Transportation, and left us only the questions of when and what kind.

I say, with the utmost respect, that the time to act is now—during the 89th Congress—while the record is fresh and while the issues are clearly fixed in the minds of the people who are concerned with transportation and transportation's goals and problems. If the obligation is handed over to the 90th Congress, when it convenes next year, the opportunity may be lost because when issues, even of the greatest importance, are allowed to drag along they lose their urgency.

Indeed, I think the 89th Congress has inherited an issue that should have been resolved a long time ago. If I am not mistaken, it was in the 43rd Congress, in 1874, during the administration of President Grant, that the first bill to establish a centralized transport bureau or department was introduced. And every few years since that time the legislation has been dusted off and updated and introduced again. Congress acts, of course, in response to the will of the people and the people have never been sufficiently fired with the need for action. That has not been for want of study. I remember the Hoover Commission reports; the Brook-

A4036

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 1, 1966

ings Institution Transport study; the Sawyer report; the Eisenhower proposal; and the Doyle report, all of which, plus others, strongly advocated and clearly documented the reasons for a Department of Transportation. But all of these recommendations were lost for want of leadership and public enthusiasm. I hope there will not be a repetition of that story today.

I fully realize that even among some of the strongest supporters of the present proposal there is a considerable disagreement with respect to certain of its features. There is disagreement both with respect to what the proposal does and what it does not do. I am confident that some of the members of your Committees have reservations about some of the features of the bills. Some of the disagreements that has come to my attention seems to revolve around the use of words and I believe it can be removed by clarification. In my opinion the one cardinal thing that has to be borne in mind is that a clear line of demarcation must be drawn between executive functions—promotional, operational, research, and the like—and regulatory functions which are the prerogative of Congress. We had some reservations on that score and we submitted some simple language changes for your consideration. Beyond that, the other questions of coverage become a matter of judgment.

The question of whether all safety functions should be transferred to the new Department is the subject of conflicting views. It seems to me that logic is on the side of those who advocate centralized responsibility and authority in this critically important field. Surely there is complete agreement that one of the most important and most desirable features of the legislation is the National Transportation Safety Board which it would create.

I have not heard any reasons which are convincing to me why all other safety matters should not be transferred to the Department. However, our industry has not made any recommendations one way or the other because we think Congress is more interested in hearing from the people who are directly and more importantly involved.

A great deal of apprehension has been expressed about Section 7 which provides for the development of transportation investment standards. I am sure you are all familiar with the arguments, pro and con. I am not going to express an opinion on the merits of the issues involved in Section 7, but I pose one question: Would there still be valid reasons for establishing a Department of Transportation if Section 7 were omitted from the legislation? I submit that there would.

The important thing, I believe, is to keep clearly in mind the main goals to be achieved by a transport department. I would list among them the more effective management of transportation functions within the Executive Branch; the development and implementation of coordinated Executive policies in transportation; the coordination and more effective carrying out of Government transport programs; and finally—and most important—the research, study, and planning necessary to tailor transportation to the needs of a growing America.

I sincerely believe that the research and planning functions would, in themselves, justify the creation of a Department of Transportation. There has never been a time when it was more important to look to the future needs and requirements of the Country, from both an economic and military standpoint, and to start planning to make transportation responsive and adequate to those needs. Magnificent though the performance of our transportation system has been in the past, we are confronted with problems for which there is no precedent in history.

The population explosion alone will impose burdens on tomorrow's transport system which simply stagger the imagination. By the most conservative of estimates the population of the United States will exceed 300 million by the year 2000—and that is not in the dim and distant future—it is only 34 years from now. And we must plan to live in a world which is growing in population at an even faster pace. Throughout all the centuries that man occupied the earth, the population of the world had reached only 1.5 billion at the beginning of this century—and then the population doubled in just 66 years.

Our cities, of course, are increasing in population at a more rapid pace than the Country as a whole. It is estimated that the urban population will at least double by the end of the century. How in the world will the people be moved? And while the population is centralizing industry is decentralizing, compounding the transport problem. Transportation is simply having to accommodate itself, as best it can, to the changing conditions, but there is no overall planning, no charting of future courses, no authoritative direction.

What kind of a transportation plant must we have to accommodate the population and the economy which we may anticipate in the year 2000? Must we stack highways on top of each other, or will they go underground? Will solids be moved through pipelines? When will the airlines reach a saturation point and what will we do about it? Would we be wise now to start planning more high-speed rail service?

It is pretty late in the day for us to get started on finding the answers to these and other questions. What planning there is being done today is just as segmented as the patchwork of bureaus and agencies which we have set up to handle various phases of the transportation situation. When he was testifying the other day before the Senate Government Operations Committee former Federal Aviation Administrator Halaby put the matter very succinctly. Mr. Halaby said:

"... very few people want to go from airport to airport—they want to go from a door to a door. Now, the Dulles, Friendship, and Washington National situation, indicates what is wrong. That is, nobody has planned the whole transportation system. Nobody is trying to get Mr. Rumborff from Hartford to his desk. Each of us is trying to get Mr. Rumborff through some section of the trip."

And so it is in the transportation of property. Not enough attention has been given to the problem of getting goods all the way through from the shipper's door to the receiver's platform, wherever they may be located.

If the population continues to expand and the economy continues to grow at the current rate transportation will have to at least double its capacity and its facilities in the next 20 years. Can we afford to let the plant just grow, like Topsy, or should we start tomorrow to construct a sensible plan?

I need not point out the terrible urgency of planning for the kind of transport system and the kind of mobility on a worldwide scale which we need and must have for the defense of the Nation and for the support of our armed forces wherever they have occasion to be. Weaknesses have come to light in our privately owned transportation system in connection with the supply problem in Vietnam. There should be some centralized awareness of these matters and steps should be taken to correct the deficiencies.

And we should not forget that if our planning fails to include safety we can anticipate that the population will not grow quite as rapidly as the trends indicate. We will kill off large numbers of our people by the jug-

ernauts which we build in the name of progress.

The burden of my remarks is simply this: If we agree that we need and ultimately must have a Department of Transportation, let's get started! The conditions which point to the need of a Department will not improve by next year—they will be worse.

If there is serious doubt about the wisdom of transferring some of the functions that are proposed to be transferred by the bills, or about some of the powers and duties which should be conferred on the Secretary, then I say let us establish the Department and transfer those functions about which there is no serious question. The Secretary of Transportation will not be idle if he does not initially have all of the duties and responsibilities which the bills provide for. He will have a monumental organizational job which will keep him busy for quite a while. And he will have more than enough to do if he gets his research and development plans off the drawing board.

If a Department is created we will learn as we go along. Some of the disagreement about certain of the proposed transfers rests, in my opinion, on a fear of the unknown and a reluctance to change a system that is muddling along. Time, experience, and demonstrated effectiveness may remove some of those fears.

To plan for a transportation system adequate to the future needs of a growing and dynamic America I earnestly recommend that a Department of Transportation be established this year, by this Congress.

## Tax-Free Fund and Socialism

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 1, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence Fertig, columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, published a column on July 23, entitled "Tax-Free Fund and Socialism," which is quite provocative and brings to light some activities of the tax-free foundations which I at least did not know. His column follows:

TAX-FREE FUND AND SOCIALISM  
(By Lawrence Fertig)

"Toward Community: A Criticism of Contemporary Capitalism" is the title of a pamphlet now being distributed by a tax-exempt foundation—the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. This organization, which is an offshoot of another foundation, The Fund for the Republic, is raising millions in contributions from the public. The essay is by Richard Lichtman, a staff member, who is also a cosponsor of an organization which calls itself the New Left School in Los Angeles. Faculty members at this New Left institution include Mrs. Dorothy Healey, chairman of the Communist party of California.

Lichtman's theme is that the free enterprise system should be abolished because it is inhuman. Today's welfare capitalism, is just as evil as laissez faire capitalism, he asserts. He does not veil his objective. He wants to move "toward community." This is frankly an appeal for socialism of some kind—either as in Russia and Iron Curtain countries, or as in Algeria, Egypt, Indonesia. It means dictatorship.



August 1, 1966

17004

## AREA MEMBERS

Area politicians also are well represented. Among them are J. Newton Brewer Jr., of Rockville, chairman of the Maryland State Racing Commission; Clive L. DuVal, Democratic candidate for Congress in Northern Virginia's 10th District; Leonard J. Kardy, Montgomery County state's attorney; and Stephen F. Leo, a Fairfax County Democratic leader.

Also included among the lengthy list of President's Club members at least four men whose names were prominent during the investigation into the business activities of Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, former secretary to the Senate majority. They are Max Karl, Bedford Wynne, Cyrus T. Anderson, and Clinton Murchison, Jr.

Karl was head of the Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Co. of Milwaukee, a company in whose stock Baker and his associates traded heavily.

Anderson was head of Go Travel, a Washington travel agency whose secretary was Baker. Anderson also was Washington lobbyist for Spiegel, Inc., a Chicago mail-order firm whose stock Baker also traded heavily.

Murchison, a wealthy Texas oil man, and Wynne, his associate, were questioned by the Senate Rules Committee in connection with alleged irregularities in the construction of D.C. Stadium.

Also listed as a Club member is J. T. Ruth-erford, a former Texas congressman defeated in a 1963 bid for reelection after he admitted receiving a \$1,500 contribution from Billie Sol Estes and pleading Estes' case before the Agriculture Department.

## LOBBYISTS, LAWYERS

Both Anderson and Rutherford have registered as lobbyists, as have several other members of the President's Club, including Lloyd M. Cutler and Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior from 1949 to 1953.

Cutler last year registered as a lobbyist for the Bahamas government and for a committee advocating repeal of the excise tax on automobiles. Earlier this year, he registered as a lobbyist for the auto industry during the congressional battle over auto safety regulations.

Chapman's law firm registered last year as lobbyists for the Alaska Pipeline Co. and for a Mexican group interested in liquor legislation.

The club's rolls include a number of lobbyists, lawyers practicing before federal regulatory agencies and "manufacturers representatives."

"There's always the charge that people are buying influence," said Al Mark, information director for the Democratic National Committee. "But we're trying to make sure the club isn't used in that manner at all."

Among those club members in private industry who were surveyed, only one hinted at such a motive. An officer in a large construction firm, he said his company held no government contracts, "but we'd certainly like to have some." Asked if his recent \$5,000 contribution to the President's Club might help, he said: "I can't see how it would hurt."

## JOHNSON ADMIRER

Andrew G. Haley, head of a large Washington law firm specializing in radio and television cases, said he joined "for one simple, basic reason—I admire the President's program."

He added: "It doesn't open any doors at the Federal Communications Commission. You don't do things that way. We put in a good application, do things squarely and they give us a break."

Wesley West, a Houston oil producer who, along with his wife, gave \$10,000, said he contributed because he has known Johnson since 1937. "I don't have any business in Washington. I have no government contracts and I never want one."

Thomas J. Lynch, a Washington lawyer, said the contribution of \$1,000 was only part of "regular participation in party affairs."

A local management consultant, who asked that his name not be used, said his President's Club membership "hasn't opened any doors for me—and I didn't expect it to. I gave to support the President and the Democratic administration."

## DROPPING ANTITRUST SUIT IS HIT

Rep. GLENN R. DAVIS, R-Wis. said yesterday he questions the Justice Department's dropping of an antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch, Inc., while it is "vigorously prosecuting" similar suits involving three smaller Wisconsin-based firms.

Davis told Atty. Gen. Nicholas Katzenbach in a letter that the public will have difficulty understanding how the suit against the Anheuser-Busch beer firm was termed a weak one by Katzenbach while the others are apparently strong cases.

Anheuser-Busch, Davis pointed out, is the nation's largest beer producer.

The Justice Department, Davis said, is taking to the Supreme Court a suit against Schlitz Brewing Co., which attempted to purchase a 39-percent interest in Labatts, a Canadian brewery which owns part of General Brewing Co. in California. He said Schlitz is 15 percent smaller than Anheuser-Busch.

The Justice Department also has pending in Wisconsin federal district court, he said, an antitrust suit attempting to dissolve the merger eight years ago of the Pabst and Blatz brewing companies, whose combined brew, he said, is less than 5 percent of the national beer supply.

A spokesman for the Justice Department, said the case involving the Schlitz Brewing Co. was taken to the Supreme Court on appeal by the companies involved, instead of by the department.

The Justice spokesman also said the Pabst-Blatz case originated under a Republican attorney general in 1959, and is now in the district court in Wisconsin because the government won its case in supreme court and it is up to the lower court to carry out the decree dissolving the merger.

## SHIPMENT OF ANIMALS HALTED AT THE 12-MILE ZONE

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I have heard some very distressing news. A shipment of wild animals, destined for several American zoos may end in tragedy at the 12-mile limit unless the Secretary of Agriculture takes immediate action. These innocent and lovable animals may be dumped overboard if the vessel carrying them is not allowed to land.

I have written the following letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking that he take immediate steps to avert this tragedy. The letter to the Secretary follows:

AUGUST 1, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture,  
Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing this letter to you in the urgent hope that your timely intervention might save the lives of 54 innocent wild animals en route from Africa.

I am informed that these animals, includ-

ing approximately 14 giraffes will be dumped over the side of the ship *Massiloyd* at the 12-mile limit unless you personally intervene to prevent their death. Presently, it is the position of officials in the Department of Agriculture that these animals may not be admitted to the United States due to the inadvertent failure of the animal importers and shipping company to comply with an existing USDA regulation.

As the ship has already sailed from Lisbon, and as the cost of returning to Africa is prohibitive, the failure of the USDA to take some steps to make alternative arrangements will result in the shipping company's having no alternative but to put its entire cargo of beautiful wild animals, destined for a number of zoos across the United States, overboard.

As an animal lover I implore you on behalf of myself and millions of other animal lovers throughout this country to take some steps immediately to prevent the senseless death of these helpless animals.

I repeat, it is imperative that action be taken quickly, as the *Massiloyd* is due to arrive outside of New York some time this weekend. Only your timely intervention can prevent this tragic result.

Sincerely,  
GLENN CUNNINGHAM,  
Member of Congress.

## FREE ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 20, a few weeks from now, the United Nations will reconvene in New York. Our representative will appear before that international body to record this country's hopes for peace in the world.

On September 11, a mere 9 days earlier, there will take place, in South Vietnam, an event which will speak to the world more clearly than any possible declaration of America's sincerity in its quest for peace in the world and the self-determination of all countries. That event, of course, is the election scheduled by the present South Vietnamese Government.

The nature of the election on September 11 will do more than demonstrate to the world the degree of American devotion to its announced aims in the struggle still racking that unhappy land. The way in which that election is conducted will also reveal to ourselves, to us Americans, just how seriously we take those aims.

Are we in arms in Asia to insure, as we say, the rights of small nations to determine the form of government and the direction of national evolution for themselves?

Or are we there solely to hold back a Communist threat we regard as directed ultimately at ourselves? And if so, in pursuit of that aim, is the fate of smaller nations unimportant to us so long as they conform to our changing strategy of defense?

## THE CENTRAL ISSUE: FREE ELECTIONS

The central issue in the elections of September 11 is whether they will be truly free and honest, an accurate reflection of the mind of the South Vietnam

August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17003

a photo album of the President's family, special passes to the 1964 Democratic National Convention and other similar favors.

Similarly, until early this year it was rare to find a contribution in excess of \$1,000—the standard "membership fee."

Several months ago, however, President's Club fund-raisers began making preparations for the organization's first big Texas social event since Johnson became President.

An estimated 900 Texans—and the President—attended the 6-hour-long dinner-dance at Houston's Shamrock Hilton Hotel on April 28. Many of them apparently were anxious to continue the Texas tradition of big spending.

The club's financial records show that several dozen Texans contributed two, three and four times the minimum amount requested.

Several gave \$5,000, the maximum federal law allows an individual to contribute to any political committee. Some signed up their wives for an additional \$5,000.

## EXPECTATIONS DIFFER

At about that time word was quietly passed that big donors might find their names on White House invitation lists—not a startling innovation since big contributors to the party in power have traditionally been invited to attend White House social functions. In recent months, a number of President's Club members have attended White House dinners and luncheons.

While the vast majority of President's Club members apparently are satisfied with a once-a-year opportunity to attend a party with the President intermittently receive White House mementos, those who regularly do business with the government—lobbyists, lawyers, consultants—view the club as a means of access to federal officials.

"I don't expect any big favors just because I paid my \$1,000, but being able to attend parties with people who are making the decisions does give you a certain access you wouldn't ordinarily have," said one lobbyist.

Another explained: "It (club membership) doesn't open any magic doors, but it's certainly no secret that a lot of business is done over cocktails in Washington and the people who attend these parties are the ones who can help me most."

When the club was organized five years ago by Richard McGuire, then treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, its primary purpose was to help raise money for the party which traditionally had to rely on small contributions.

In the ensuing years, the club became the Democrats' chief source of financial support and during the Kennedy administration it reportedly collected \$1,950,000. By the time the 1964 elections rolled around, gifts of \$500 or more accounted for 69 percent of all money flowing into the party treasury.

## BIG GIFTS ZOOM

In the 1960 election, Republicans had received more than twice as many contributions in excess of \$10,000 than the Democrats, but in 1964, Democratic donations from the so-called "fat cat" givers far outnumbered the Republican contributors in the same categories.

In the three months immediately preceding the 1964 election, the President's Club received \$2,071,940 and spent \$2,057,003, according to its reports.

In the last two months of 1964, the club took in another \$660,826 and spent \$673,064. The first nine months of 1965 were lean ones, however, for the club. It reported income of \$100,057 and reported expenditures of \$70,230.

In the last quarter of that year, income rose significantly, principally because a major effort was made to sign up Washington-area residents prior to the party at Shriver's home. Income during those three months

was \$278,186, but expenditures also were up considerably. They amounted to \$869,008, much of that going to pay off the last debts from the 1964 national campaign.

In the first two months of this year, the club took in \$125,600 and spent \$26,342. From March through May—the last report on file—the club had \$917,253 in income and \$342,157 in expenses.

In addition to the income reported by the club, the Democratic National Committee's financial report for the March-May period shows an additional \$275,000 from several local President's Clubs.

## RAISED \$4.2 MILLION

All in all, since August, 1964, which is as far back as records are available for public inspection, the organization has taken in more than \$4.2 million and spent more than \$4 million.

During the 1964 campaign, much of that money went to state and local Democratic organizations. The next year, the club helped pay many of the party's outstanding campaign debts, including more than \$100,000 to four Washington hotels.

Doyle, Dane Bernbach, the New York advertising agency which handled the party's 1964 ad campaign, received \$100,000 from the President's Club in 1965 and another \$50,000 in 1966.

Other expenditures listed by the club in recent years helped to pay for campaign literature, buttons, badges and similar items.

The importance of the President's Club to the Democratic party fund-raisers is indicated by the fact that during the first quarter of this year the club produced \$917,254 in income, compared with \$642,553 raised by the Democratic National Committee through other techniques such as the "sustaining membership" program, which requires a \$10 minimum contribution, and the "Dollars for Democrats" drive, in which an individual can give as little as \$1.

## DINNERS CLOSED

President's Club events are closed to the press, but the organization's most recent major party, held in New York a month ago, newsmen were able to overhear Johnson say:

"The Democratic party was \$4 million in debt when I took office. Since then, the debt has been reduced to about \$1.5 million and a few more dinners like this should put the Democratic party in the black."

An estimated 1,750 persons attended the New York event—actually two separate parties held concurrently at the Waldorf-Astoria and Americana Hotels on June 11.

Earlier this year, a similar function was held in Chicago. The Texas party drew donors not only from that state but from Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas and New Mexico.

When he travelled to the Midwest several weeks ago, Johnson made an appearance before about 200 persons at a President's Club cocktail party in Des Moines.

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY spoke before a President's Club luncheon in St. Louis last week. That was the trip that set off some Republican sniping because the plane which carried both the Vice President and Donald Turner, assistant attorney general in charge of the antitrust division, to St. Louis was provided by the Anheuser-Busch brewing firm.

House Republicans had questioned whether there was any connection between the Justice Department's dismissal of an antitrust suit against Anheuser-Busch last month and the contributions made to the Club by company officials several weeks earlier.

## PARTY POSTPONED

Still another major President's Club party was scheduled early this month in Los

Angeles. The event originally was to have been held last fall, but was postponed after more than \$300,000 had been collected.

The second postponement came two weeks ago when Johnson decided to pass up a trip to California, reportedly because of concern over stirring up anti-war sentiment.

California Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown is understood to have been relieved over the second postponement because he will need substantial financial support in his race against Republican gubernatorial candidate Ronald Reagan and feared the national party's fund-raising effort would deprive him of as much as \$1 million.

At each of the President's Club events Johnson attends, he circulates widely, shakes as many hands as possible and, if the crowd is small enough (as in Des Moines), poses for pictures with each member.

This year's list of more than 800 names is top-heavy with Texans, many of them oilmen. Although Houston, Dallas and Ft. Worth are the most frequently listed cities, there are members from such smaller towns and cities as Midland, Dickinson, Wichita Falls, Waco, Edinburg, Lubbock and Jasper.

Among the big Texas donors are Lloyd M. Bentsen Jr., president of the Lincoln Liberty Life Insurance Co., whose family has given \$8,000; Paul F. Barnhart, a Houston oil man who gave \$5,000; Alfred W. Negley, a San Antonio rancher, who along with his wife, donated \$8,000; and Mrs. Frank W. Sharp, a \$5,000 donor and wife of a Houston construction executive.

## NON-TEXANS, TOO

Roy Hofheinz of Houston contributed \$5,000 and his wife a similar amount. Hofheinz is board chairman and president of the Houston Sports Association and of the Houston Astros Baseball Club.

He is head of the delegation seeking to have the 1968 Democratic National Convention held in Houston's Astrodome stadium.

Non-Texans who recently made big contributions include: New York jeweler Harry Winston, designer of the wedding ring for the President's daughter, Luci, gave \$2,500, an amount matched by his wife; Charles Revson, chairman of Revlon, Inc., a \$5,000 donor; Paul Mannheim and Maurice Newton, both New York investment bankers, \$5,000 each; and John W. Overton of Montgomery, Ala., president and general manager of the Turner Insurance & Bonding Co., \$5,000, an amount identical to his wife's donation.

In the \$1,000 category, well-known political names abound. Among them are Neil Staebler, Democratic National committeeman from Michigan; Indiana Gov. Roger D. Branigan; Detroit Mayor Jerome P. Cavanaugh; New Mexico Gov. Jack Campbell; Tennessee Gov. Frank G. Clement; former Ohio Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, and former Louisiana Democratic National Committeeman Camille Gravel.

Several members of Congress also count themselves among the President's Club members. Included are Senators J. WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT, D-Ark.,—a persistent critic of Johnson's Viet Nam policy—and CLINTON P. ANDERSON, D-N.M., and Reps. OLIN TEAGUE, WRIGHT PATMAN, and JACK BROOKS, all Texas Democrats.

Among the high-ranking members of federal agencies who have joined are J. Warren Darling, director of foreign economic affairs for the Defense Department; Leonard H. Marks, director of the U.S. Information Agency; Theodore M. Berry, director of community action programs for the Office of Economic Opportunity; John Harlike, chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission; Bess Abell, social secretary to the President; Eva B. Adams, director of the Bureau of the Mint; Willard Dason, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and Stanley S. Surrey, assistant secretary of the treasury.



August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17005

nation, or a mere burlesque of democracy designed and executed to impart the aura of legitimacy to the present Ky regime.

It is important to the future of Vietnam, it is important to the cause of freedom and democracy in the world, it is extremely important to the United States which way the elections turn out. It is also within the power of the United States to influence mightily the outcome of the event. Not, I hasten to add, by our actually taking over the conduct of the elections or even supervising them. For we are, in some sense, interested parties in the election and therefore not the proper referee. But we have a duty to ourselves, to South Vietnam, and to the principles we espouse in international affairs to move swiftly and effectively to secure meaningful and honest international supervision of the electoral process soon to being.

It is the right and duty of the United States to protest against electoral regulations which will in any way diminish the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese voter.

So far, progress toward international supervision has been nonexistent.

## GENERAL KY'S DECREE AGAINST NEUTRALISTS

So far, in South Vietnam Premier Ky has issued a decree barring from the election all "Communists, pro-Communist neutrals or neutralists whose acts are advantageous to the Communists."

It is obvious that such language, subject to the exclusive interpretation of the government in power, is an instrument ready to hand to that government to make the election not a free expression of the will of the people but an automatic and no doubt overwhelming endorsement of the government in power. It is a pattern with which we are all too familiar in the 20th century and in all parts of the world. It is the corruption of democracy, the pollution of the electoral process. It is the same whether it takes place in an American big city ward, in a "people's democracy," in a Nazi or Fascist country or in a new nation.

So far as has been revealed to the public, there has been no American protest against that arbitrary voter qualification imposed by Premier Ky. There should be such a protest, and it should be immediate and forceful.

So far, too, international supervision of the election remains a romantic dream, very reluctantly acknowledged as vaguely desirable by Premier Ky, very faintly endorsed by the United States.

The South Vietnamese Government—reportedly at American instigation—did indeed invite the United Nations to "witness" the September elections, a process very different from any effective measures to keep the elections free and honest. A bystander may witness a crime, but it is the function of organized law to prevent crime.

Even this ineffectual measure has gotten nowhere. At the first sign of opposition to such action, the United States has reportedly abandoned any effort to obtain U.N. participation.

This combination of a meaningless gesture to start with and the instant abandonment even of such a gesture

raises the inevitable question whether anybody's heart was really in it from the beginning.

FREE ELECTIONS ARE DIFFICULT, BUT THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR THEM

If there are members of the U.S. Government who take a cynical view of the elections in South Vietnam, they should be made aware that they do so to the great peril of the very cause they presumably rank as more important, that of this country's security.

For the underlying justification of the U.S. presence in Vietnam is to insure the right of the Vietnamese to choose their own destiny, insofar as that is ever within the abilities of a people. Insofar as it is, however, our whole history, our most fundamental beliefs and our specific declarations of intent in the world all agree that that aim is best pursued through free elections.

In the midst of war, especially in the midst of the kind of war now being fought in Vietnam, free elections are bound to be difficult.

But their advantages far outweigh their difficulties.

They offer the possibility, obtainable in no other way, of a viable national government commanding the support of a majority of the people and of the main social forces in the nation. Such a government, deriving its powers from the consent of the governed, would have a far better chance than the current military rulers of creating the rural development, the social and governmental reform which must underlie the military effort if peace and stability are to be achieved.

Wiping out oil tanks, mining harbors, even bombing the cities of Haiphong and Hanoi, these measures alone will not prevent Communist success in South Vietnam so long as the country is governed without the consent of the people, by a government chosen by itself.

THE UNITED STATES IS ON RECORD FOR FREE ELECTIONS

Our Government has stated its support for free elections over and over again. In last January's American 14 points, on which an "honorable peace" is to be sought, point 9 declares:

We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their choice.

On May 17, speaking in Chicago, President Johnson said America will continue in Vietnam "until the gallant people of South Vietnam have their own choice of their own government."

On May 27, in a news conference, Secretary of State Rusk said:

We believe that it is important for them (the South Vietnamese) to proceed with the elections for a Constituent Assembly so that you have a representative group from all sections and all elements in the population, (so that) they can draft a constitution, and move toward that government which Prime Minister Ky in January indicated South Vietnam ought to have—that is a constitutional government based upon popular elections.

The question is, Will the electoral process now being shaped in South Vietnam provide a real choice for the South Vietnamese people? Will it indeed produce a constituent assembly which rep-

resents "all sections and all elements of the population"?

As things now stand, with Ky's order against "neutralists" and against those his government feels give help to the Communists by their "neutralist activities," and further with no hint of international supervision, the prospects for such an election are very dim indeed.

PAST VIETNAMESE ELECTIONS HAVE NOT REFLECTED THE FREE WILL OF THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE

That gloomy prospect is reinforced by a look at recent Vietnamese history in regard to free, honest, and truly representative elections of the kind we want and South Vietnam desperately needs.

Before World War II, what is now South Vietnam was organized as Cochinchina and French Indochina. It elected representatives to the French Parliament. But the franchise was so restricted that only about 5,000 native Vietnamese voted for each Senator and Deputy.

That example was the beginning of modern representative democracy in South Vietnam. Things have not changed notably for the better since.

In January of 1946, "national" parliamentary elections were held—and largely controlled—by the Vietminh. Most of the candidates had Vietminh approval and in many districts there was only one candidate, the Vietminh-approved one. Voting was not secret and where there was an open choice, voting was conducted under the supervision of the Vietminh forces.

At the village level, the Vietminh introduced such "democratic" trappings as "people's councils." They then insisted on holding village elections roughly every 6 weeks until all opposition candidates had been defeated or had dropped out of contention. Once the Vietminh was in power, the frequency of elections dropped markedly.

Thus was an indigenous pattern of elections established which was different from the one imported from France but no more truly representative of the people.

In 1949 Bao-Dai formally assumed power and followed the 1945 precedent of Ho Chi Minh by promising the people a national assembly. This was to be a three-stage affair: the popular election of village and municipal councils, which were to elect provincial councils, which were to elect the national assembly.

The first stage was taken in January and June 1953 in areas still under French control. This included about 25 percent of the territory and 50 percent of the people, yet the franchise was so limited that only a million persons were eligible to vote.

These elections were intended to be honest and to reflect the will of the electorate. The Vietnam expert, Prof. Bernard Fall, summed up:

The French knew that the elections would go against them, but finally felt that an anti-French but palpably honest election would help their cause more than yet another phony operation. However, political rivalries among the non-Communist Vietnamese finally had the same result. In the North Vietnamese Red River delta, the right-wing governor's Dai-Viet (Great Vietnam) Party managed

17006

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 1, 1966

to have only 687 out of 5,861 villages declared as "secure" enough for voting, which immediately raised a storm of protest and resulted in a revision of the village lists. The same problem is likely to arise in any future election in South Vietnam.

Subsequently there were some important political leaders named to provincial councils, but the national assembly was never chosen.

The melancholy record continued under the Diem regime. In 1955 the beleaguered Vietnamese were given the opportunity to choose at the polls between Bao Dai and his prime minister, Ngo Dinh Diem. Diem would easily have won a fair election, but apparently the thought never occurred to him. He used government machinery to produce an all-but-unanimous vote for himself. In Saigon, for instance, Diem managed to attract 605,025 votes from only 450,000 registered voters.

In 1956 and again in 1959, the regime held parliamentary elections. In the first, the non-Communist parties of opposition boycotted the elections, charging that the electoral regulations failed to provide for freedom of opinion, press meetings, and organization. In the second, the Diem government simply refused to allow any of the non-Communist opposition groups to organize for participation in the election.

The government financed the candidates, printed the literature, controlled the advertising, the radio time, the public meetings, everything about the electoral process. The possibilities for manipulation were infinite, and the Diem regime used most of them. A rubber-stamp parliament was returned in both cases.

In some areas the actual balloting and vote count were honest, apparently. In Saigon at any rate, a non-Communist, Harvard-trained, anti-Diem candidate, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, was elected even though 5,000 troops were trucked into his district to vote against him.

When the chips were down, however, Dan and another successful opposition candidate were barred from their seats on trumped-up charges of vote fraud. Dan was imprisoned and tortured in the Saigon zoo.

The next legislative elections took place in 1963, when, according to Professor Fall, "the regime simply invented election statistics," producing a legislature which was "a perfect cross-section of the oligarchy which has never ceased to run things in South Vietnam."

Meanwhile, in 1961, Diem was overwhelmingly re-elected president against the opposition of two put-up candidates.

From election to election and from area to area, government handling of elections has varied. Reports are sketchy at best. But in general it may be said that the government controlled the participation of political parties; it threatened or cajoled anti-government candidates into withdrawing; it gave favored candidates special help, ranging from advantageous placement of posters to the use of troops as pressure and as actual voters; it used local officials to make it clear to voters, especially in rural areas, who the government was for; less frequently, there was fraud in

the vote count and there was the stuffing of ballot boxes.

On May 30, 1965, South Vietnam again voted for local councils and there seems to have been a change in style. The elections were held in all 44 provinces and the five autonomous cities. Of some 4.5 million persons of voting age in the areas under government control, 3.4 million, or 70 percent voted by secret ballot under universal suffrage. The election was apparently honest and fair with no disenfranchising provisions against "Communists or neutralists."

Although government control over all the campaign necessities was maintained as before, the civilian regime of Phan Huy Quat apparently did not tamper with the electoral process. But it should be remembered that the councils elected have slight and ill-defined powers.

PROSPECTS FOR FREE ELECTIONS IN SEPTEMBER ARE NOT PROMISING

Of the upcoming elections in September, we already know a number of discouraging facts:

General Nguyen Cao Ky would much rather not have any elections at all. He has talked vaguely of postponing them to some far-off future time.

Second, the elections are not for a legislature, but for a constituent assembly which will dissolve after drafting a constitution rather than convert itself into a legislature after the 1956 precedent. After the constitution goes into effect, the regime in power is to establish new governmental organs as ordained by the constitution within 3 to 6 months. At that time, too, new elections are to be held for a national legislature.

Third, under present circumstances, the Vietnamese voters will have no opportunity to cast their votes for neutralism and negotiation with the Vietcong if that is their will. It is probable that they will have a choice only among candidates and policies acceptable to the present government.

For in addition to the June 19, 1966 decree of the Ky government barring from the election all "Communists and pro-Communist neutrals or neutralists whose acts are advantageous to the Communists," there is an earlier decree, of May 17, 1965, imposing criminal sanctions on "all moves which weaken the national anti-Communist effort and are harmful to the anti-Communist struggle of the people and the armed forces." Likewise condemned are "all plots and actions under the false name of peace and neutrality."

To be blunt, the government is thus able to exclude from the electoral process just about anyone the government does not want in. Such undesirable persons may even be thrown into jail if judged guilty of "plotting" for peace.

In short, General Ky's electoral invitation to the South Vietnamese people, complacently acquiesced in by the United States, is to "come out and vote for me and the policies I am pursuing."

PHONY ELECTIONS WILL ERODE OUR POSITION

Mr. Speaker, if one more set of phony elections takes place in South Vietnam with the appearance of American sponsorship, we are headed for increased turmoil within that unhappy land, and for

a continuing loss of support through the world for our position in South Vietnam.

What is needed now above all else is to give the Vietnamese people their first real opportunity to express themselves freely on their future course, and on the crucial issue of peace and war.

The electoral process must be impartial as among candidates and parties.

Candidates must be as free to espouse neutralism and peace negotiations as they are to advocate the Western alliance and expanded warfare. Let the rival policies be put to the test of equal and free competition for the acceptance of the people.

The United States is saving South Vietnam from total collapse and propping up the Ky regime. We therefore can and should demand that the election-rigging decrees be rescinded, that provision be made for a free election that we can publicly support.

This much the United States can do appropriately. What we cannot do is to give the detailed supervision needed to assure that the electoral process is not rigged in the many other ways long practiced in Vietnam.

The United States is an interested party to the elections. For this country to act directly by itself in supervising the South Vietnamese electoral process would carry unmistakable and unacceptable overtones of colonialism.

What we can do, what we ought to do, what we must do, is to take vigorous action now to secure an international overseer.

An international presence on the scene would not only help insure that the elections themselves are free and honest. It would bolster the credibility of the election results throughout the world and in Vietnam itself, where the average voter, quite understandably, may by now be somewhat cynical about elections.

U.N. SUPERVISION OF THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ELECTION WOULD BE BEST

Certainly the best organization to supervise Vietnam's elections would be the United Nations. The record of the U.N. and of its predecessor, the League of Nations, shows conclusively that internationally supervised elections can be conducted so that honesty, openness, and freedom are guaranteed. This has been demonstrated in at least seven cases over the years.

In 1935, the League carried out a successful and trustworthy referendum on the future of the Saar in the face of an initial campaign of terror and intimidation by Hitler. The League assembled an international force of 3,300 men to assure a free choice for Saarlanders.

The U.N. Trusteeship Council has supervised elections in at least five former trust territories: British Togoland, French Togoland, the Cameroons, Ruanda-Urundi and Western Samoa. In those cases U.N. supervision helped assure the acceptability of election results within the territories and abroad. It created legitimacy, without which no government can long function.

U.N. supervision of elections in Korea is especially relevant, because the United States was involved in war in that country in circumstances somewhat similar

August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17007

to those of our present involvement in South Vietnam.

In May 1948 and again in May 1950, U.N. supervision of Korean elections played a part in obtaining the free expression of the will of the South Korean people.

The United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea—UNTCOK—was established by the General Assembly in 1947 after the United States, as the occupying power in South Korea, submitted the problem of Korean independence to the U.N. over Russian objections.

The mission of UNTCOK was to "observe that the Korean representatives are in fact duly elected by the Korean people and not mere appointees by military authorities in Korea." North Korea, supported by the Soviet Union, refused to permit elections, but with the support of the United States, UNTCOK proceeded with free elections in the South. It oversaw the preparations for elections, toured the country and interviewed candidates. Nine groups visited polling places and witnessed the opening of the ballot boxes. According to one evaluation:

UNTCOK probably exerted a favorable influence at the time of the elections. The rightists groups under Syngman Rhee, which were sponsoring the election, did not control the Assembly and had to form a coalition in order to obtain a majority. Unquestionably, more groups participated in the election than would have been possible if UNTCOK had been absent. The electoral procedures which UNTCOK had recommended were generally followed and were helpful."

The temporary commission was transformed into the United Nations Commission on Korea—UNCOK—"available for observation and consultation in the further development of representative government based on the freely expressed will of the people." Despite the objections of the Rhee government, which maintained that South Korea had all the representative democracy it needed, UNCOK continued to function and was supervising an election in May-June 1950, when North Korea attacked. Its subsequent report clearing the government of charges of malpractice was certainly a factor in maintaining internal stability during the precarious months ahead.

Surely the United Nations can eventually play a similar role in South Vietnam. The Ky government has already invited the U.N. to "witness" the elections, whatever that may mean. The United States, as Kay's patron and supporter, is in a strong position to persuade—indeed, to insist—upon the advantages of asking the U.N. to assume a more extensive and a more meaningful role.

It is apparently true that a Security Council majority is unwilling to approve any U.N. role in the South Vietnamese elections. But if Security Council action were blocked by veto, the United States could appeal to the General Assembly under the Uniting for Peace procedure. We should not hesitate to make the effort merely because there is a chance of failure.

There is much criticism of U.S. policy in Vietnam. We would do well to make an opportunity to answer that before a

world forum such as the General Assembly.

## BUT TIME PRESENTS AN OBSTACLE

The one serious objection, of course, is time. It would appear to be all but impossible to get an effective United Nations electoral supervision force organized and in the field between now and September 11. The United States should therefore aim its efforts at securing such a force for the promised national elections for a national assembly in South Vietnam, elections due to take place from 3 to 6 months following the September elections of a constituent assembly charged with adopting a constitution.

But all is not lost for September by any means. There does exist the International Control Commission for Vietnam, set up by the Geneva Conference of 1954. The members are Poland, India, and Canada, with India as permanent chairman. Their specific mission is to supervise events in Vietnam with a view to insuring that the will of the people themselves be consulted and that it prevail. Both sides to the conflict in Vietnam have occasionally invoked the name of the Geneva Conference. The ICC is an actual device of that conference, available for use. There is no use more germane to its purposes than the supervision of the September election.

It may be anticipated that Poland, for example, would not wish to involve itself with anything having to do with the "American imperialists." That may be so. Therefore I suggest that this government immediately approach all three nation-members of the commission, as individual members, not as a corporate body, and request their participation in the September elections in South Vietnam. We would very likely receive the cooperation of Canada and India; and with that secured, Poland may well come along rather than be left out. The presence of India, especially, as a great Asian nation and as a potential mediating force between East and West, would be effective in the present and a good omen for the future.

## THE ICC AS AN ELECTIVE SUPERVISOR

The International Control Commission, Vietnam, would be in a position to supervise elections in South Vietnam, for the following reasons:

First. The ICC, Vietnam, is not subject to the direction or guidance of any continuing body. It was established by the Geneva Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam, which was signed by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the French Union. The ICC, Vietnam, received some guidance in its activities in the final declaration of the Geneva Conference. But the Conference did not provide any additional means of giving policy guidance to the ICC, Vietnam, while the Agreement merely provides that the ICC shall inform members of the Conference when the ICC's activities are hindered or when one of the parties fails to put into effect its recommendations. The practice of the ICC, Vietnam, reporting to the cochairman of the Conference—United Kingdom and U.S.S.R.—and receiving guidance from them, is strictly customary, without any legal standing.

Second. The ICC is not paralyzed by a rule of unanimity. The Geneva agreement provides that the recommendations of the International Commission shall be adopted by a majority vote except that they must be unanimous in cases "concerning violations, or threats of violations, which might lead to a resumption of hostilities." Thus, Poland could not legally block a decision by India and Canada to supervise the elections in South Vietnam.

Third. The supervision of elections in South Vietnam would clearly go beyond the specific duties imposed upon the ICC, Vietnam, by article 36 of the agreement—control of armed forces movements according to the regroupment plan, supervision of the demarcation lines, control of the release of prisoners of war, and supervision of the agreement of the introduction of armed forces, arms, and so forth. However, the agreement envisioned democratic governments. Article 14 calls upon each party to "refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons on accounts of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee their democratic liberties." The final declaration looked toward the enjoyment by the Vietnamese people of "the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot." Although this was to have been accomplished through general elections in both the North and South in 1956, it can be argued that the current South Vietnamese elections are a step toward eventual free determination of their fate by the Vietnamese people. Furthermore, the ICC, Vietnam, has concerned itself with the development of democracy in Vietnam at least to the extent of charging the South Vietnamese Government with violations of the provisions on democratic freedoms—presumably article 14—of its seventh interim report.

Fourth. The initial strength of the ICC, Vietnam, was 160 Canadians, 300 Poles, and 500 Indians. Although it is apparently smaller now, it could be quickly built up again. The ICC already has a "political committee," in addition to military and administrative committees, which could undertake the supervision of elections.

Aside from the question of persuading India and Canada to use the ICC to supervise the South Vietnamese elections, there are two problems—neither insuperable—which have confronted the ICC, Vietnam.

The Geneva agreement made no adequate provisions for administrative, logistical, or financial support for the ICC, Vietnam. But surely if there is a will to use the ICC, a financial way can be found.

The South Vietnamese Government, which did not sign the Geneva agreement or participate in the final declaration has shown itself consistently hostile to the ICC, Vietnam. Under the Diem regime a mob sacked the ICC's offices in Saigon. The fourth interim report of the ICC, Vietnam, pointed out its difficulties as a result of the "categorical attitude" of the South Vietnamese Government that it has "not signed the Geneva agreement" and that it was "not legally bound by its provisions and was opposed both to the agreement and the final declaration."



17008

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 1, 1966

The United States could persuade the Saigon government to take a different view.

#### KY SHOULD WITHDRAW HIS DECREE

Such, then, is an immediate program for the United States by way of carrying out our own pledges of interest in the will of the people of South Vietnam, and by way of assuring the world that our interest is sincere, that our presence in that distant land is not merely an instance of international power politics.

The program has three parts:

One and at once: Bring pressure to bear upon General Ky to rescind his decree banning electoral participation to those in disagreement with him and his policies;

WE SHOULD INVOKE BOTH THE ICC AND THE U.N.

Two, and also at once: Move to secure the supervision of the International Control Commission by approaches to the individual members, India, chairman, Canada, and Poland, and at the same time move forcefully to secure General Ky's approval of and cosponsorship of this invitation to supervise.

And three, as soon as may be: Initiate proceedings in the United Nations, with both the Security Council and the General Assembly, to put representative government in South Vietnam under long-term U.N. supervision and scrutiny, as was done successfully in South Korea.

Only by such action can we hope to convince the world, the Vietnamese, and perhaps even ourselves, of the sincerity of our position in Vietnam.

But more important than the conviction of sincerity is the simple fulfillment of American promises. If we are in Vietnam to assure the freedom of the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny, it is high time for us to make the first strong move to enable that freedom to express itself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be in Vietnam a couple of weeks ago, during the Fourth of July recess.

While I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman in the well today, and I respect him for his concern, I must say that judging from the preparations—that other Members of this Chamber and I have witnessed in Vietnam—being made to hold these elections, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the elections are going to be fair, as fair as is humanly possible under wartime conditions, and that every possible effort is going to be observed to make sure that a constitutional assembly is elected, which will indeed reflect the will of the electorate, and that that assembly then will proceed to draft a constitution for the return of constitutional civilian government to South Vietnam.

I was very much impressed, and my colleagues who were with me were very much impressed, by the statement made by General Ky, or Premier Ky, as he is now known by virtue of his civilian title, when he expressed his complete confidence that within 6 months after September 11 he fully expects the constitutional assembly to have drafted a con-

stitution which will be acceptable to the people and which will indeed guarantee them the rights for which they are now fighting. Furthermore, he fully expects to have a government elected by the people within the framework of that constitution.

As I say, I respect my colleague from Wisconsin for his remarks today, and I certainly have no question as to his deep sincerity in making sure that everything is being done in Vietnam to assure the highest standards of integrity and democracy in this process.

But I have only one fear, which is that when we try here to prejudice these elections, before they are held on the 11th of September, unfortunately we might unwittingly and innocently be giving those people who would not want those elections to be held a tool with which to work. There are forces, particularly in North Vietnam, which would want to do everything they can to wreck these elections, because they know if these elections are held the people of South Vietnam and of North Vietnam will see that even during a wartime condition, when the very existence of South Vietnam is being threatened by the enemy, the people of South Vietnam, through their officials, are able to move toward the adoption of and the establishment of democratic institutions.

So I do hope my colleague from Wisconsin is going to clarify that point. I know what he is trying to do, and I share with him his strong desire to make sure that everything is done to make these fair and democratic elections. However, I can assure him, having spoken to people there in the last 2 weeks, that indeed everything is done. As a matter of fact, South Vietnam is uniquely well prepared for these elections. I confess I was very surprised to see the extent to which the machinery is now available over there to proceed with a meaningful election of this constitutional assembly. Elections are not foreign or totally new to the people of South Vietnam. They have been holding elections for many, many years and very often under very difficult conditions. So it is my hope we are not going to do anything in this Chamber that is going in any way to complicate or make more difficult what is already at best a very difficult assignment. I have full confidence that on September 11 these elections are going to be held and those people who want to participate in the magnificent experience of a democratic process are going to have that opportunity. There is no question in my mind but what between now and September 11 and on September 11 those who do not want any democratic institutions born in that country are going to do everything humanly possible to wreck those elections and to discredit them and to try to set up a facade which would indeed give the Communists in North Vietnam an excuse for saying, "No. These elections were not fair, they were not honest or they were not meaningful or representative." I do think, though, that we in this country—and I am not suggesting that the gentleman in the well is by any means suggesting that, and I hope he understands it—we in this country must weigh our actions very

carefully to make sure we do not do anything that is going to undermine the full respect of the people in this coming election, because indeed this is the turning point. I expect after September 11 when the people of North Vietnam have seen for themselves that indeed what we are fighting for in South Vietnam is to give the people dignity and a voice in their government, that the people of North Vietnam are going to start realizing their present leadership of Ho Chi Minh and all of these other Communists who refuse to come to the bargaining table or the negotiating table are not indeed representing the best interests of North Vietnam but are instead representing their own narrow political interests. I place a great deal of faith in these elections. I am glad that the gentleman brought this subject up. I want to congratulate him, but I also hope that we will get some expression here so that his remarks are not misunderstood. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman's contribution. I recognize that he speaks from the vantage-point of having very recently been in Vietnam. I also thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the Communists, including those of North Vietnam, are dead set against free elections and would like nothing better than for this election to be a farce or a burlesque. However, the reason I have taken the floor this afternoon is, believing as I do and as the gentleman from Illinois does deeply in the principle of free elections, I am anxious that our Nation may come before the bar of world opinion after those September 11 elections with what is known in the old courts of equity as clean hands. I cannot help but be very uneasy about the fact that here on August 1 the South Vietnamese Saigon Government is going into those September 11 elections with a decree, a law, an ordinance outstanding which bars from participation in those elections those whom Premier Ky chooses to call neutralists. I am also disturbed because as I read in the Wall Street Journal of last Thursday, in a dispatch from Saigon which I have no reason to disbelieve, that Premier Ky served notice if there is anything he does not like about this constitution that is adopted by the constituent assembly as a result of the September 11 election, he will veto or change it and only a two-thirds majority of that constituent assembly will be able to change it back. It is these things which convince me that we have not done what we ought to do to see that we come before the bar of world opinion with clean hands.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I yield again to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not know what are the sources of the gentleman's information, but I have seen some pretty good examples of some very bad reporting. I have seen good examples of good reporting, too. When we were there we raised this very question. I can tell the gentleman that the assurances were given to us that anyone who was otherwise qualified could vote in this election except that Communists cannot seek a seat in this constitutional assembly.

August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

17009

Now, the important thing was this: Communists will be permitted to vote, if they want to vote in this election. They will be permitted to vote. But the election will not permit members of the Communist Party to seek office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some pretty strict regulations controlling the candidacy of candidates in our own country.

Mr. REUSS. All I am concerned with, if I may point it out to the gentleman from Illinois, is the wording of the June 19, 1966, decree of the Ky government which states that "all Communists and pro-Communists, neutrals or neutralists whose acts are advantageous to the Communists" are barred from the election.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It means, running for office, and does not mean from voting in an election.

Mr. REUSS. That is so, but it seems to me that an election in which the Government bars neutralists from running for office is not one for which we can take any pride before the bar of world opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I would call the gentleman's attention to an earlier decree, of May 17, 1965, of the Ky government which is still in full force and effect—"which weaken the national and anti-Communist effort and are harmful to the anti-Communist people in the Armed Forces."

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, condemned are "all policies and actions under the false name of peace and neutrality."

Now, take those words as you will, they seem to me to spell out to reasonable men throughout the world that this is a "cooked election" in which neutralists and antigovernment people are not permitted to take part.

Mr. Speaker, if there is any verbal dispute between myself and the gentleman from Illinois, why does he reject my suggestion that we get the Ky government to clarify this, if the Ky government's position is what the gentleman infers it to be, based upon his oral conversation with Saigon officials? Then it should be proper to say it in the good, commonsense "Chicago" language which the gentleman knows how to use.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would join with my colleague because, first of all, I did not indicate any discussion about neutralists, and I would agree with the gentleman that if in the principals per se there is a difference it ought to be corrected. I do not know any reason why neutralists should not be permitted to participate or run for office.

Mr. REUSS. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Chicago say so, because it narrows to a very small margin any differences that may exist between the gentleman and myself.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As the gentleman knows, it is the policy of our Government, enunciated by the President—

Mr. REUSS. Yes; in the January 4 declaration of this year—

Mr. PUCINSKI. And enunciated by responsible members of our Government, that if and when this new government is elected in a democratic manner in South Vietnam, if that government should in its judgment ask us to leave, we would leave. In other words, we

would respect the wishes of this legitimate, bona fide, legal government.

Mr. REUSS. And, therefore, is it not necessary, in order that our words not be a mockery, that we make it clear that we do not relish an election which is closed to political figures which might conceivably take away that very hope that you and I would hope, that the free exchange of the South Vietnamese people were an optimum for our side in the way we look at things? But, since, as the gentleman from Illinois points out, we have made public for many months and stated that we are prepared to sit still for whatever the free and unfettered manifestation of the will of the South Vietnamese will be, and it certainly behooves me, it seems to me, that any laws or decrees to the contrary ought to be repealed right here and now, and not be left on the books until election time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I might say to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] that President Johnson has made this point over and over and over again in every quarter of this world where they will listen, that many of these problems could be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to run an election in wartime, especially the kind of war that we are witnessing in South Vietnam, a war of terrorism and subversion, the kind of war where one does not know who the enemy is because you cannot identify him, during the day he is plowing the fields, and at night he is terrorizing villages—in this kind of war the situation with reference to any election is difficult at best. And, so, President Johnson has so publicly stated—if Ho Chi Minh will pull his troops out and stop his aggression, we can indeed end this hostility, because there is nothing more that America wants than to get out of Vietnam and let these people proceed and have elections and let everyone run for office, because you would not have wartime conditions. You will have an atmosphere conducive to a good election.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], that under present conditions—and I have nothing but the highest admiration for the people of South Vietnam, who, despite this war, are trying to proceed and hold an election.

I think that this speaks well for them. Certainly, it speaks louder than anything they might say, that indeed they hope to see democracy prevail in South Vietnam once the hostilities are ended.

Mr. REUSS. What would speak louder, though, would be the prompt repeal by the government of General Ky of his outstanding legal decree which, in effect, prohibits opposition parties and neutralists from taking part in the election.

But I thank the gentleman from Illinois for a very worthwhile contribution.

## U.S. POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATES POLISH MILLENNIUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning in post offices throughout the United States a new 5-cent stamp appeared. The stamp, issued by the U.S. Post Office with the cooperation and suggestion of Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, commemorates the 1,000th anniversary of our traditional friend and ally, Poland.

I was very happy to learn last Saturday evening during an inspiring banquet, attended by more than 1,200 people at which the Postmaster was the principal speaker, that 115 million—yes, 115 million of these stamps had been printed for distribution this morning and because of the advance orders for this stamp, the Post Office had to print another 10 million.

In other words, 125 million of these stamps were made available for sale to the general public this morning throughout the United States.

I think that this tremendous response to the United States Poland millennium stamp indicates the warm feeling of friendship that exists between the people of our own country and the people of Poland. A friendship that goes back in America to the year 1610 when Capt. John Smith brought the first group of Polish immigrants to America to man the first factory in this country, the glass works in Jamestown.

Ever since this first group of Polish immigrants arrived, Poles have migrated to this country from many parts of Poland and have made impressive contributions to our development. They enjoy a fine reputation in this country for honesty, integrity, and hard work.

I think that the occasion last Saturday gave Postmaster General O'Brien, and also the president of the Polish American Congress, Mr. Charles Rozmarek, as well as the Right Reverend Bishop Wycislo, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, and many others an opportunity to review the many, many years of friendship between this country and Poland. But more important, it gave us a chance to review the thousandth anniversary of this gallant nation. A 1,000th anniversary that marks 10 centuries of heroic struggle for the freedom and dignity of man.

Postmaster General O'Brien stated it very beautifully, I think, when he said that what President Johnson and the American people are trying to do in Vietnam today is what the Poles have been trying to do for 1,000 years of their history, to prove that the struggle for freedom is a struggle "for your freedom and mine." So I submit that we Americans who have participated in the determination to make this stamp part of the millennium observance can indeed look back today on a marvelous achievement. This little stamp with its red background and its white eagle—yes, the white eagle with the crown of Poland's sovereignty during the past 1,000 years, will carry a message all over this world that the people of the United States respect and indeed dignify the great contribution that the Poles have made during the past 10 centuries.

17010

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 1, 1966

It was, therefore, Mr. Speaker, with some concern that I read an editorial yesterday in the Washington Post dealing with Poland's millennium.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in my respect for the Washington Post. It has been a source of important and well documented information to me and to other Members of Congress for many years and I have admired the strong position taken by the Post on many controversial issues. It is truly one of America's great newspapers. So I must say with some regret that while the first paragraph of the editorial was in my judgment sound thinking, other parts of the editorial carried an outrageous distortion of historical facts.

The Post was correct when it said that—

Poland can be justly proud of its millennium. A thousand years of history is an awe-inspiring achievement, when one thinks of the more pretentious powers and civilizations that have come and gone over time. If survival is the test of the strength and legitimacy of a national idea, then the Poles have indubitably passed. It is a tribute to the faith and tenacity of the Polish people that they could have kept a national spirit alive for a thousand years, when the national body was so often broken.

I agree with this, for here the Post quite properly and correctly reflects 10 centuries of heroic struggle by the Poles for the dignity of man.

In our own country, it was the Polish people who made a most significant struggle for human dignity at the very beginning of our Nation.

I said earlier the Poles were brought to America in 1610 to work in a factory, in the glassworks in Jamestown. But for 9 years, because of their immigrant status, they were not permitted to own land or vote in elections. In 1619, the first strike was staged in this country, the first demonstration in America, and it was staged by this handful of brave Polish people, who said, "Unless we have the same rights as others here for dignity and freedom, the right to own property, the right to participate in elections, we refuse to work."

It was not a strike such as we see today for material gains. It was a strike for human gains and social justice. Captain Smith summoned the special session of the House of Burgesses, the legislature of those days, and by resolution gave these Poles the same rights of citizenship enjoyed by every other American on this continent.

The Post is correct therefore, when it says that the Polish people have kept alive the spirit "for a thousand years, when the national body was so often broken."

But the Post errs when it tries to associate the situation in Poland today against the glorious 1,000 years of Poland's history.

The Post says:

The current Communist government of Poland, which has ruled a mere 22 years, regards its own establishment as "the victorious crowning of ten centuries of our history." It identifies its own rationale as the introduction of socialism.

The Post says further:

The claim to have brought Poland far toward economic and social justice is fair.

I believe the Post errs when it says the claim is fair. I do not believe that Communist doctrines imposed on the Poles have brought Poland anywhere near to the kind of industrial achievement that the free nations of Europe have enjoyed since the end of World War II. When we consider the situation in Poland—and I was there last December—when we consider the economic situation under a Communist doctrine, and compare it to the advances made in England and France and the Scandinavian countries and in West Germany under a free concept of economy, whatever gains have been made in Poland or in any other country behind the Iron Curtain under communism dwindle into insignificance.

So, with all due respect to the fine men and women who write these editorials for the Post, I must register my dissent, because it is wrong to conclude that Poland has been brought toward economic and social justice. I say this is an unfortunate distortion of the facts.

Furthermore, the Post says:

Life is still hard there but Poland was one of Europe's most backward countries before the Soviet Army seated a puppet Communist government in 1944.

Is one to conclude that what the Post is saying is that the Poles have gained stature and opportunity only since this present government came in? I say this is also an outrageous attack on the truth. The Poles have been a gallant nation for many, many centuries before the Communists came. If anything, history will show that it is this present philosophy in Poland, which has been imposed upon the people against their will, which has been one of the less productive eras of this nation's glorious history.

Furthermore, the denial to our American cardinals and bishops to go into Poland and participate in millennium activities at Czestochowa, the denial of a passport to Cardinal Wyszynski to come to this country—are these the gains that the Post would have us believe were made under the present Polish Government?

I say the Poles are being held back from advances and progress that could equal or even surpass the progress that has been made in the free nations of Europe today because of artificial restrictions presently imposed on their inherent talents.

Finally, the Post says:

America can regret that the millennium did not evoke warmer expressions of the two nations' traditional friendship.

The warmer relations did not develop because of anything the United States did or did not do. They failed to develop because it was the Polish Government that refused our bishops admission to Poland to participate in this great religious observance; this rededication to Christianity for Poland.

This Polish millennium is a Christian holiday and the Polish people know that the one catalyst which has held Poland together for 10 centuries has been an un-

yielding and abiding faith in justice of their religion.

Certainly there are those today who would like to destroy this spirit of the Poles and their religious leaders.

When His Holiness, Pope Paul, indicated he would like to go to Poland to participate in this millennium, the doors were closed. He was told that the political atmosphere was not right.

When our own American bishops and our cardinals wanted to go there, the same excuse was given.

We hope that warmer relations can develop between America and the people of Poland. Our nation continues to work toward that goal.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Post says:

The unnecessary provocative postage stamp which the U.S. issued for the millennium, bearing the emblem of pre-Communist Poland, did nothing to ease a relationship that—we hope—will warm and expand as Poland enters its second thousand years.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Postmaster General of the United States, Lawrence O'Brien, one of the closest friends of our late and beloved President Kennedy, has written his own chapter of "Profiles in Courage," when he issued this stamp. He had the courage, against great pressures, to depict a symbol of a free Poland, a Poland which has existed for 1,000 years, and to ignore the protestations of a government which has been there for only 22 years.

This beautiful stamp, which went on sale today throughout America—the 125 million missiles of friendship between America and the people of Poland—is going to carry the message of the glory of Poland for 1,000 years—of a Christian Poland, a Poland respecting God as the maker of man, and not a Poland dedicated to the atheistic and false doctrine of those who now rule this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Post errs in criticizing or chastising anyone for issuing an "unnecessarily provocative postage stamp."

Yes; this stamp is going to carry a message to every corner of the world, but it is going to be a message of a Poland steeped in the tradition of freedom and human dignity for 10 centuries.

The Poles are a hardy people, and I have no doubt that when the final chapter of Poland's millennium is written, it will be freedom that will survive, a freedom that has been carved out by 1,000 years of dedications to social justice.

It has never been my purpose to try to tell a newspaper what to write but I submit, Mr. Speaker, the Post would have been more timely in its tribute to Poland's millennium if it had devoted some of its space to Postmaster General O'Brien's excellent speech delivered last Saturday at the Park Sheraton Hotel at the first day ceremony for the Polish millennium stamp.

This was a memorable ceremony. I should like to include the inspiring remarks by Postmaster General O'Brien in the Record today.

The millions of people who have learned to respect Poland's unyielding struggle against all forms of tyranny owe



## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 1, 1966

## DEFENSE FOR SIERRA CLUB

With what sensible observers have appropriately described as "incredible swiftness for a federal agency," the Internal Revenue Service has moved to question the tax-exempt status of the Sierra Club after the organization placed full-page advertisements in eastern newspapers criticizing the proposal by the Bureau of Reclamation to build dams on the Colorado River and urging Congress to block the proposal. The swiftness with which the IRS moved in this instance has prompted speculation that the criticism of the bureau and the Johnson administration for supporting its proposals inspired the action.

If such is the case, it is time that the American public assembled its resources to defend the Sierra Club as a symbol of American freedom of thought and to remind the federal establishment that such employment of its administrative powers amounts certainly to an exercise in police state tyranny. The power to tax is the power to destroy, and the action of the IRS in the Sierra Club case is a clear demonstration of an effort to exemplify the truth of this axiom.

The Sierra Club record for disinterested contention in support of the right of the American people to preserve, defend, and enjoy the natural scenic and historic places of this nation is one that shines as a beam of inspirational steadfastness amid the confusions and conflicts of the past half century. Since its founding by John Muir, the paragon of battlers for the basic right of Americans to enjoy their natural heritage, the Sierra Club has followed without wavering the guidance of its founder. This newspaper has not always agreed with the club's opinions, but it has appreciated and defended consistently the validity and worthiness of its purposes. We do not and cannot agree with the action of the IRS or the people in the administration who directed this action. It smacks too much of police state methods.

It is hoped that the Sierra Club will be able to muster sufficient support to discourage any further experiments in tyranny of this sort.

## LEAVE TRAVEL IN VIETNAM TO OUR FIGHTING MEN

(Mr. DOLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Defense, with considerable prompting from the able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and his ranking minority colleague, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, put a stop to the phony war college in Vietnam which our commanders there were being forced to conduct for political candidates.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the ban should now be extended to cover all Government agencies. My attention has been directed recently to another aspirant for Congress, a Mr. DuVal, who is seeking the congressional seat now held by our hard working and able colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

According to newspaper accounts, Candidate DuVal is or was until recently on a Vietnam junket for the announced purpose of inspecting the U.S. Information Agency activities there.

At least this is what he claimed in his departing press conference, when he is quoted as saying:

As a former General Counsel of the USIA, I have been asked to take a look at our information program in Vietnam.

The interesting thing about Mr. DuVal's excuse for nudging into the political limelight with a visit to Vietnam—apparently so that some of the blood, sweat, and tears of that bloody disaster will rub off on him for the duration of his campaign—the USIA does not know anything about his announced intentions to investigate its activities in Vietnam.

I quote from a letter I received from the General Counsel of the USIA, dated July 27, 1966, which contains the following statement:

The Director of the USIA has not communicated with Mr. DuVal concerning his Viet Nam trip nor do we know of anyone on his staff who has.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. BROYHILL's opponent was trying to deceive the people of the 10th District of Virginia by implying, and expecting that they would believe, that a trip made solely for political benefit was for official business.

Mr. Speaker, I am very fond of my able friend from Virginia's 10th District, and know he has one of the toughest jobs in this Congress representing what is probably the fastest growing district in this Nation. He needs no help from me, I am sure, to win his justly deserved reelection. His constituents know his record well and have repeatedly returned him to Congress.

They know of his own personal experiences in the military service in World War II, from private to company commander, the Battle of the Bulge, his capture by the Germans, and a daring and dangerous escape from that captivity.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] is not going to Vietnam as a visitor to enhance his political prospects. He does not need to do so, and he has too much sense to try and phony up his campaign by stretching the credibility of his friends and constituents in Virginia by trying to don a phony warrior's toga. His record does not need it.

Nor do the fighting men in Vietnam, or the warriors of USIA, need assessment from political hopefuls who clutter up the rear echelons and interfere with the war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Department of Defense ban on nonsense trips to Vietnam be extended to cover all administration agencies, before candidates for public office start using the highway beautification program as an excuse for going there.

I don't believe Saigon has been reapportioned into anyone's political district, and until it is I suggest our political hopefuls campaign at home and let the soldiers win the war there without having to wet nurse any more unnecessary visitors.

## THE PRESIDENT HAS FAILED TO SEND TO THE CONGRESS A MEASURE WHICH WILL EFFECTIVELY DEAL WITH STRIKES WHICH AFFECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST

(Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, 1966, the Congress received the President's state of the Union message. At the time, you will recall, the New York subway strike was in progress. In his message, the President stated:

I also intend to ask the Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading State and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

This is almost 7 months later, with the 89th Congress hopefully moving into its closing weeks, but yet the President has completely failed to send us a measure which will effectively deal with strikes which affect the public interest. The currently extended airline strike is a result of his inertia in this field.

It is long past time for the Congress to act in the field of industrywide strikes and industrywide collective bargaining, all of which are injurious to the public. The country wants positive action, and I hope that this will be one of the first orders of business.

I include an article from the Wall Street Journal of August 1, 1966:

## THE POLITICS OF LABOR WARFARE

With few major contract talks scheduled, most observers saw 1966 as a year of relative labor peace. As this newspaper reported the other day, however, the labor front this year has been anything but tranquil.

While the warfare on the airlines and elsewhere may thus have been surprising, it is certainly explicable. Its roots, like those of most wars, are deep in politics and extend back more than three decades, when the Government set out to strengthen unions.

An alleged aim was to achieve a "balance of power" between business and labor, and though the scales may indeed have been weighted toward employers then, it's the other way now.

On little more than whim, a single union now can tie up the nation's trucks, stop its railroads or shut down its steel mills. The unions' disruptive potential is only too obvious; yet state, local and national officials usually are unwilling to do much toward bringing it under control.

A large part of the problem is that many politicians are convinced, some of them probably with justification, that they owe their jobs to labor union support. The result has been that official labor policies sometimes seem founded more on fear than on common sense.

Aware that the general public opposes strikes by teachers, nurses and other public employees who provide vital services, state legislators righteously rush through harsh laws banning such walkouts. When strikes nonetheless come, state and local officials simply do not enforce the laws; complainantly they give the employees' unions about all they ask.

In the circumstances it's hardly startling that public employee strikes are spreading far and wide. They are likely to continue to proliferate unless politicians find the wisdom and courage to pass and enforce laws that not only ban the strikes but provide workable machinery for equitable settlement of future disputes.

On a national level, the Federal Government similarly knows that a long strike of a major industry—autos, for example—severely damages the public's interest. Its response has been to move ever earlier into negotiations, usually coming up with a settlement pretty close to what the union sought.

Once this destruction of collective bargaining has begun, the unions quite naturally use their power to demand more and

16994

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 1, 1966

more; the inevitable outcome of excessive power, after all, is abuse. Thus the Machinists Union turns down a fat contract drawn up by a Presidential board and ties up 60% of the nation's airline traffic to press for more.

This development led to a lot of talk in Congress of a law to force a suspension of the strike, but the President finally engineered an agreement between the negotiators which was rejected by the union members, calling for a raise even bigger than his own board had recommended. Even now, though, there's little conversation about trying to curb the unions' power to cause such chaos; in fact, many politicians seem bent on adding to the unions' strength.

The Federal Government, moreover, is even giving the unions what amounts to a fair excuse for throwing their weight around. It is doing so through its inept efforts to cope with inflation, since a union leader surely has less trouble selling a strike to the membership now that most of the members' wives are grumbling about growing grocery bills.

Nor does Washington help matters with its wage-price "guideposts" against inflation, which stipulate that wages should rise no more than 3.2%. When unions pay any attention to the guideposts at all, it is generally only to regard the 3.2% as a floor, not a ceiling. Wage demands thus are pushed up to levels where some companies simply cannot afford to cave in without a fight.

Truly effective moves against inflation, involving significant cuts in Federal spending, therefore would not only shore up the dollar but also make a real contribution toward labor peace. The fact that the politicians still reject that combination, and not merely this year's barrage of strikes, is what ought to be disturbing if not surprising.

## KIND WORDS FOR DREW PEARSON

(Mr. TEAGUE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I never thought the day would come when I would be standing here in the well of the House saying a kind and complimentary word about Drew Pearson. But I do call to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Pearson's splendid column in yesterday's Washington Post in which he discussed the subsidy—2 percent interest on loans from Uncle Sam—now enjoyed by rural electrification co-ops, and their tax-free status, again at our expense.

And, Mr. Speaker, I might add the fact that we now have under consideration before the Committee on Agriculture a request by the REA people to go much further. They want to continue their tax-free status and 2-percent loans and also receive huge Federal funds in order to create an "electric bank," with loans made by that bank to be guaranteed by the Federal Government—which means all the taxpayers in the country.

The column follows:

L.B.J. AND TAX-FREE CO-OPS: REA'S CLYDE ELLIS, WHO ONCE BEFRIENDED PRESIDENT, DEFENDS SPECIAL STATUS

(By Drew Pearson)

President Johnson has an easy way to save several million dollars this year; abolish the bargain-basement interest rate and tax-exempt status of Rural Electrification Admin-

istration co-ops. Some budget advisers are advising him to do it.

This, however, would be a blow to one of LBJ's old friends, former Congressman Clyde Ellis of Arkansas, who has built up the REA co-ops to a point where they rival private industry.

This was not what the Rural Electrification Law was intended for when passed by the New Deal in 1936. At that time vast areas of American farmland were without electricity. Today 98 per cent of American farms are powered by electricity and the REA co-ops have developed to the point where they distribute power to wholesale buyers, factories, and even to competing public utilities. Private companies pay 48 per cent taxes; the REA co-ops pay nothing. Private utilities pay around 6 per cent interest on their bonds; the REA co-ops pay 2 per cent.

This week Congress upped the interest rates for Government loans to underdeveloped countries. But the same Congress has refused to up interest rates to REA co-ops. Meanwhile some local co-ops merely reinvest their 2 per cent money at 6 per cent. This gives them a neat profit of 4 percent.

The Colorado Supreme Court last February cracked down on one of the major REA co-ops, the Colorado-Ute Electric Association, organized to distribute wholesale power to Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Arizona. The court ruled that this combine was a long way from the Roosevelt 1936 proposal to supply power to remote farms where private utilities had failed to penetrate.

However, Clyde Ellis once befriended Lyndon Johnson when he was running for the Senate in Texas, and Lyndon is a man who doesn't forget. When Federal Power Commission Chairman Joseph Swidler proposed that the FPC regulate REA co-ops if they operated across state boundaries, Clyde Ellis became so indignant that he exerted all his considerable power on Congress and the White House.

Congress then passed a special law exempting REA co-ops from FPC regulation, while LBJ refused to reappoint Swidler as FPC chairman. Swidler, the man who dared tangle with Clyde Ellis, is out.

The President has now nudged the REA with an order that it must lend no money beyond the fiscal year just ended. He could go further and remove REA's tax-exempt status and its 2 per cent interest. He would thereby save a sizable chunk of money.

## HOME BUILDERS RELIEF ACT OF 1966

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the disaster threatening the lumber industry in the Northwest, to which I referred on the floor of this House 2 weeks ago, is even more real today than it was then. The drift continues without any real leadership by this administration to repair the damage done and to prevent its worsening. Mortgage money is extremely scarce today, with consequent suffering of those thousands of Americans desiring to buy and sell homes.

Today I am introducing legislation which in effect would terminate the Participation Sales Act of 1966, passed by this Congress. Under the act, on June 23, two sales have apparently been made. The first was in the amount of \$350 million of participation certificates of assets of the small business obligations trust at an interest rate of 5.75 percent with maturity length varying from 1 to

5 years. The other sale was of \$180 million in participation certificates of assets of the Government mortgage liquidation trust with an approximate interest rate of 5.40 percent, the maturities ranging from 13 to 15 years.

One of the gravest legislative mistakes made by this Congress was the passage of the Participation Sales Act of 1966. This act was one of the greatest hoaxes of this Congress. It is obvious to me that very few people in this country have been or are presently aware of the insidious, disastrous consequences of this act. It is for this reason that it was passed by a determined and compliant majority with little or no desire and no real consideration in the committee. Incredible as it may be, the bill was not available to committee members until only a half hour before the committee hearings began, and only 2 hours of hearings were then held.

The minority members of the committee were denied the right to call any witnesses. Moreover, not one witness from the unions, farming, business, or banking communities was called. At the conclusions of the totally inadequate hearings, the committee was called into immediate executive session and in less than 30 minutes the bill was ordered reported. This was the day after the President's message calling for this legislation was received by the Congress. This legislative action certainly went far beyond what has become standard rubberstamp procedure in this 89th Congress. This bill obviously permits the Johnson-Humphrey administration to conceal huge budgetary deficits.

Members of this body will recall the strenuous objections made by the unanimous Republican minority to the Participation Sales Act of 1966. The minority objections were on varying grounds. One of the strongest reasons for opposition was contained in the minority report which clearly sounded the warning and stated the danger on page 24 as follows:

The home mortgage market is in an unprecedented state of turmoil and confusion. This proposal would promote chaos in the market \* \* \*. The irony of the proposal is that FNMA, which is the home mortgage financing facility, would be called upon to commit harikari in the home mortgage market.

On page 34 Congressman PAUL FINO stated:

Heavy sales by FNMA of participation in pooled loans is liable to soak up investment funds available, forcing up the rates the Government will have to pay on other issues just at a time when the real budget is gravely out of balance \* \* \*. Mortgage lending is particularly likely to suffer from the impact of high-interest bearing pool participation shares \* \* \*. This participation sales program is a mechanism designed to kick the mortgage market while it is down. The public's participation in this program will also strike at homebuilders, realtors, and building trades unions.

Mr. Speaker, before the final passage of this bill, a motion to recommit was made by the minority which would require the bill to be amended to prohibit the Government from paying more than 4.75 percent interest on any participation sold. I am proud to say that

August 1, 1966

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

16913

1,648, Office of Economic Opportunity with 1,645, National Aeronautics and Space with 1,645, Selective Service with 1,459, and Tennessee Valley Authority with 1,146.

CHANGES IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AS OF THE  
END OF FISCAL YEARS 1954-66

Federal civilian employment changes, fiscal years 1954-1966, in the executive agencies of the Federal Government—showing defense agencies, civilian agencies, and total—follow:

Fiscal year end (as of June 30)	Department of Defense	Civilian agen- cies (except Defense)	Total
1954	-129,100	-32,400	-155,500
1955	-11,366	+1,613	-9,753
1956	-17,677	+17,812	+135
1957	-18,926	+35,817	+16,891
1958	-63,838	+29,628	-34,210
1959	-18,940	+18,827	-113
1960	-31,006	+46,809	+15,683
1961	-4,726	+41,155	+36,430
1962	+27,111	+50,280	+77,391
1963	-19,682	+32,795	+13,213
1964	-20,183	-7,943	-28,126
1965	+3,955	+22,582	+26,537
1966	+104,395	+128,734	+233,129

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The report to which the Senator refers, which was issued by the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, shows that for the month of June 1966, as compared with July 1965, there has been an increase in Federal employment of roughly 196,000 persons. The increase for the month of June 1966, was 73,088, which represents nearly a 3-percent increase in the Federal employment figures over the preceding month of May.

I subscribe to the view that this is a matter with which the President should concern himself in fairness to both the American taxpayers and the many splendid Federal employees who will be disadvantaged if the Federal employment figures continue to soar and increase at the rate they have during the month of June.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] for his comments.

It should be pointed out that this report was first initiated by the distinguished former senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Harry Byrd], the father of the gentleman who has just spoken. During the years it has served as a useful barometer of Federal employment.

I am hopeful that this month's report will alert the American people to the reckless manner in which the administration is unnecessarily expanding its public payroll.

#### UPSIDE DOWN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, very definitely if there is to be peace in Vietnam by negotiation, President Johnson should announce our intention to take three important steps toward that goal.

He should proclaim a pause, or cessation of U.S. bombing of North Vietnam for a period of 15 to 30 days, certainly sufficient time to impress on the rulers of Hanoi that our intent is to achieve an armistice and ceasefire in Vietnam and

directly following that with the withdrawal of our Armed Forces to the coastal areas in South Vietnam and in due time to the United States. In addition, we should propose a scaling down of offensive military activities in South Vietnam for a period of 15 to 30 days leading to a ceasefire on both sides provided, of course, that the Vietcong scale down and end offensive and terrorist attacks on our Armed Forces during such period and in all areas of South Vietnam, withhold hostile action. Then, above everything else, we should proclaim that we Americans are definitely willing to discuss a ceasefire and an armistice with delegates representing the National Liberation Front or Vietcong. In other words, despite the yapping of Prime Minister Ky and his flamboyant statements as if he were directing the policies of our Government in southeast Asia, we must proclaim a willingness to negotiate with delegates representing those who are doing the actual fighting in South Vietnam. This would mean representatives of the Vietcong as delegates independent of Saigon and Hanoi. In addition there would be independent delegates representing the Hanoi government and an equal number of independent delegates representing the Saigon government together with an equal number of our own representatives.

Then, of course, our leaders from the President on down would do well to muzzle the militarist talk of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and our generals. They do too much talking on political and foreign policy matters. Silence on political subjects is in order for them. Officials at the Pentagon, including all of our generals, would do well to bear in mind at all times that the Founding Fathers, in writing our Constitution, provided that civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority.

Mr. President, in trying to bring about an armistice and peace and end our involvement in this miserable civil war in the jungles of Vietnam which is really of no strategic or economic importance to the defense of the United States, we would also do well to encourage U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations to continue leadership in his usual impartial manner to try to bring about peace.

Unless this is accomplished the future probably holds forth for us involvement with our Armed Forces in Vietnam for 5, 10, or 20 years. This is the prospect before us. Another possibility, if not probability, due to our complete air superiority and continuing heavy bombing from the air including the destruction and killings by napalm bombing, coupled with our tremendous firepower and the presence of nearly 400,000 of the finest soldiers the world has ever seen—the cream of the crop of fine American boys—is that the Vietcong will suddenly go underground and return as peasants to their farms or go to Saigon and our bases in South Vietnam seeking jobs and piasters from the U.S. forces and civilian agencies including the CIA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of Virginia in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. With 400,000 or more GI's involved and months going by without any fighting, of course, the natural reaction in our country would be to bring the boys home. Then, who knows what will occur over there 5 or 10 years hence? In the Progressive magazine of August 1966, two thoughtful and concise statements were published on our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam bracketed on page 4 of that great publication. I refer to the items captioned "Upside Down," by James Reston, associate editor of the New York Times, and "Sledgehammers and Hornets," by Eric Sevareid, highly respected commentator of CBS. I commend these articles to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Progressive magazine, August 1966]

#### UPSIDE DOWN

With the bombing of targets on the outskirts of Hanoi and Haiphong, it [the Johnson Administration] has now done almost everything it said or indicated it would not do except bomb China, and the end of this melancholy chapter in American history is not yet.

The Johnson Administration said it was not seeking a military solution to the war, and it is now obviously seeking precisely that. It said it was there merely to help a legitimate government defend itself, and it has ended up by replacing a military clique that is not a government, not legitimate, and is not really defending itself.

JAMES RESTON.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, July 1, 1966.

#### SLEDGEHAMMERS AND HORNETS

We are not really conquering territory in Vietnam. Our official statement is that at the end of last year eight and a half per cent of the total land area was considered secure; at the end of February nine and a half per cent; all the rest is in enemy hands or disputed and unsafe, or empty. About eight million people, a bit over half the population, are in secure allied controlled areas.

We are using giant sledgehammers to kill hornets. The Vietcong's National Liberation Front in the South has an annual budget estimated at about ten million dollars. Our annual costs in this war run to about fifteen billion. The enemy needs an estimated eighty-seven tons of supplies each day; the American establishment alone needs about twenty thousand tons a day.

In terms of last year's total expenditure for the war, each enemy soldier killed last year cost us well over a million dollars.

ERIC SEVAREID.

CBS, June 11, 1966.

#### THE STRIKE AGAINST THE AIRLINES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill now pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, intending to deal with the airline strike, has not yet come to the floor of the Senate.

Reading reports from the newspapers, I observed that the two proposals being considered do not contain any provision to insure an end to the dispute.



16914

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 1, 1966

The bill which has been discussed primarily contemplates giving the President power to declare three successive 60-day periods, allowing the disputants to negotiate. However, at the end of 180 days, if the dispute is not settled, the matter comes back to Congress.

It is in this latter point that I believe the bill is weak.

Mr. President, when the bill reaches the Senate, I contemplate offering an amendment which will, at the end of the unsuccessful negotiating period, give power to the President to appoint an arbitration board vested with full powers to investigate and hear witnesses, and render a judgment on what the settlement should be.

I repeat, under the proposal which has been discussed there is no terminal point. In effect, the proposal provides for negotiation for 180 days, and if a settlement is not reached, the matter comes back to Congress.

My amendment would direct the President at the end of the unsuccessful negotiations, to appoint an arbitration board vested with full powers to render a final judgment, the judgment not to be appealable except that an appeal would lie in ascertaining whether the procedure outlined by Congress had been followed.

#### BUSINESS ECONOMISTS SAY THAT TAX HIKE COULD BRING ON RECESSION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President—

In the second half of 1966, the American economy is more likely to suffer from some insufficiency of demand than from an excess.

These are the words with which Oscar Gass opens a statement on the economy published recently by Ralph E. Samuel & Co., a New York brokerage firm. They could not be more to the point.

In his carefully reasoned discussion of the present state of the American economy, Mr. Gass argues persuasively that our economy can continue to expand at the healthy rate it has experienced since 1961.

But it will not continue its expansion—an expansion that has meant a significantly higher standard of living for the average American—if a misdirected public policy results in further economic restraints, particularly in the form of tax increases.

He notes the economic slowdown of the second quarter of this year and comments:

The slowing down of April through June is not of decisive importance. What is important is that public policy shall not be misdirected toward endeavoring to make this slowing down continue or gather momentum.

By the end of this year, Mr. Gass predicts, the distinctive fiscal question will be "how best to share—between more public expenditures and further tax decreases—a potential year's accrual from growth of over \$10 billion of additional federal revenues."

This growth will occur if we will allow the economy enough freedom. One policy we must reexamine very soon is the

rather stringent monetary restraints in effect right now, as I have advocated in recent statements.

Mr. Gass presents evidence to back up his argument that the economy can continue to grow at a relatively rapid rate. With an annual growth of about 2 percent in our labor force, and an increase in productivity equal to the average over the past several years, a 5½ percent annual growth of the economy is possible.

He goes on to discuss the economic effects of business investment, military spending, consumer demand, wholesale and consumer price trends, export and import levels and Government policy, including the wage-price guidelines.

His succinct analysis puts another well known economist on record as favoring policies that will allow the economy to expand as rapidly as possible without bringing on a general inflation, which, he says, has not occurred in the past year. The price experience of the United States in 1965-66 reflects particular scarcities—not a general excess of demand, he says.

In numerous statements, Mr. President, I have tried to make many of the same points Mr. Gass makes so well. I fully share his basic belief that our economy can continue to grow, without inflation.

We must make certain we do not cause our second quarter slowdown to deepen. The stakes are too large to allow this sort of mistake.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will take the time to read Mr. Gass' careful discussion of the forces at work in our economy. It is undoubtedly one of the best statements on this subject I have read anywhere. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that they may do so.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE ECONOMY AT MIDYEAR (By Oscar Gass)

In the second half of 1966, the American economy is more likely to suffer from some insufficiency of demand than from an excess.

At the beginning of July, the United States continues to advance in the longest economic expansion of its industrial history, excepting only the expansion which included World War II. Gross National Product has attained the range of \$730 billion—about \$9,500 for each person employed. A deliberate, capable national Political Economy over this growth.

Yet even now, apart from seasonal influences, the United States is more than one million jobs away from what would be called full employment in any other advanced country. In April through June, the advance of the economy has been slowed distinctly. Unemployment among young people, not yet securely established in work, has consequently increased sharply. Fortunately, in the first half of 1966, the White House rejected pressures to restrain the growth of economic activity still further, through a general tax increase.

The slowing-down of April through June is not of decisive importance. What is important is that public policy shall not be misdirected toward endeavoring to make this slowing-down continue or gather momentum.

Also in November and December 1966, during the planning for the next fiscal year, it is unlikely that measure to restrain the economy will constitute the correct focus of pub-

lic policy. On the contrary, it is probable that attention will be due rather to how to stimulate the economy and prolong its advance. The distinctive fiscal question would then be how best to share—between more public expenditures and further tax decreases—a potential year's accrual from growth of over \$10 billion of additional federal revenues.

#### GROWTH POTENTIAL

It is a great error, though one widely entertained, that the United States has now come within sight of the unavoidable end of a unique economic expansion—an expansion supposedly fed to unrepeatable size on the resources (of labor and plant capacity) made idle by the 1960-61 recession. On the contrary, the balance of evidence suggests that real Gross National Product can continue to rise, at least through 1970, at a rate not greatly different from the average of 5½ percent annum sustained from the beginning of 1961 to mid-1966.

The labor force needed to support an annual real expansion of 5½ percent in Gross National Product will be available in 1966-70. Since the beginning of 1961, U.S. employment (civil and military) has increased at an annual average rate of about 2 percent. But, in the next four years, it will also be possible to increase total employment by about 2 percent annually. Indeed, due to the high birth level of the years immediately after World War II, the flood of new entrants into the labor force may permit a rise in employment of 2 percent per year without reducing the 3.9 percent unemployment rate of the first half of 1966.

For the yearly difference between 2 percent more workers and something like 5½ percent more total output, it will be reasonable to look to the experienced growth of man-hour productivity. In the whole postwar period, 1947-65, the average yearly productivity increase in the whole private economy was about 3.3 percent. But in 1960-65 the annual gain averaged 3.6 percent. And in manufacturing alone, during 1960-65, the annual gain averaged about 4 percent.

We must not exclude from consideration the possibility that—given present high investment levels—the productivity gain per worker, during 1966-70, may even prove in excess of 3½ percent per year. Then the potential increase in annual output will be correspondingly above 5½ percent.

#### GROWTH POLICY

In both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, the White House has consistently leaned to the side of underestimating the growth potential of the economy.

Until 1965, the President's Council of Economic Advisers operated with a 3½ percent per year rise in potential. Then, growing bold, these White House counselors adjusted their estimate of the annual gain in potential upward—to 3¾ percent. A year later (on May 10, 1966), a member of the Council, Mr. Arthur M. Okun, took another quarter-step. "The potential growth of this economy is about 4 percent a year," he said, "that is the growth of output we can maintain. . . ."

The Chairman of President Johnson's Council, Mr. Gardner Ackley, has specifically espoused the view that the 1961-65 growth rate is unsustainable. "The growth of real output," he has said, "cannot forever be as fast as we have had during the past several years. . . . At some point, the economy will really be operating at the ceiling set by labor-force growth and the advance of productivity."

Quite. But, so much larger are the present maturing age groups than those of 1961-65, so substantial also is the pool of workers still unemployed or on short-time, that the annual percentage growth in employment need not be less in 1966-70 than it was in 1961-65. Moreover, productivity is being enhanced by the high current rate of business investment and by the better education of the young people now joining the labor force. For them